

By Mr. JONES of Washington (by request): Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Olympia, Wash., to prohibit the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor in Hawaii—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. LACEY: Memorial of John H. King and others, concerning the sale and other disposition of public lands, etc.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of the Medical Society of Keokuk, Iowa, against the passage of the anti-vivisection bill—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of Phillip Lang, of San Jose, Cal., for increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Petition of Post No. 5, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of New Jersey, in support of the House bill No. 4742, to provide for the detail of active and retired officers of the Army and Navy to assist in military education in public schools—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McALEER: Petition of graduate women nurses to secure by act of Congress employment as nurses in the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the Kansas City (Mo.) Live Stock Exchange and the South St. Joseph (Mo.) Live Stock Exchange, against increasing the tax on oleomargarine—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the New York Mercantile Exchange, indorsing House bill No. 7667, relative to the branding of cheese—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Freytag & Peeler Company, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the passage of the Russell bill, relating to the tax on alcohol used in the arts or in any medicinal compound—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the League of American Sportsmen, urging the passage of House bill 6634, for the better protection of song and insectivorous birds, the game birds, and game animals—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCLEARY: Resolutions of the Northwestern Manufacturers' Association, of St. Paul, Minn., indorsing House bill No. 887, to provide for adding to and completing specimens and productions, etc., to be exhibited in the Philadelphia museums—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of H. H. Meyer and other druggists of Sleepy Eye, Minn., relating to the stamp tax on medicines, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, letter of Noyes Brothers & Cutler, of St. Paul, Minn., favoring provision for irrigation of arid lands—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. MEEKISON: Papers to accompany House bill No. 7703, granting a pension to Lee Kuney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 5441, granting a pension to Hugh Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OTJEN: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Henrietta Pollok, of Milwaukee County, Wis.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS: Petition of fourth-class postmasters of Rutland County, Vt., praying for the passage of the Cummings bill increasing the compensation of postmasters of the fourth-class post-offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. RAY of New York: Petition of Acme Grange, No. 498, of North Barton, N. Y., favoring a general free mail delivery—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Resolutions of the Minneapolis (Minn.) Commercial Club, in favor of the proposed national park in northern Minnesota—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TAWNEY: Resolutions of the State Agricultural Society of Minnesota, protesting against the passage of Senate bill "to promote commerce and increase the foreign trade of the United States and to provide auxiliary cruisers, transports, and seamen for Government use when necessary," in its present form—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THROPP: Paper to accompany House bill No. 8403 to confer jurisdiction on Court of Claims in the Pittsburg defense claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petition of D. H. Harler and other citizens of the Thirtieth Congressional district of New York, in favor of the passage of House bill No. 3717, relating to oleomargarine and other dairy products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS: Paper to accompany House bill No. 8183, to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Michael Fitzgerald—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of Pennsylvania: Resolution of the Northeastern Pennsylvania Press Association, urging the passage of House bill No. 5029, to put wood pulp and printing paper on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, letter of Frank B. Rose, of Swarthmore, Pa., relating to section 11 of the naval personnel bill—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, February 17, 1900.

The House met at 12 o'clock m., and was called to order by the Speaker.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT.

The SPEAKER announced the appointment, as chairman of the Committee on Railways and Canals, of Mr. DAVIDSON.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows: To Mr. NEEDHAM, for three days, on account of sickness.

To Mr. LIVINGSTON (at the request of Mr. MADDOX), for this day, on account of sickness.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 2708. An act to amend an act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1899—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2650. An act granting an increase of pension to Katharine Taylor Dodge—to the Committee on Pensions.

EULOGIES ON THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE BLAND.

Mr. DE ARMOND. I ask unanimous consent that Saturday, April 7, beginning at 1 o'clock, be set apart for the delivering of eulogies on the life and character of our late colleague, Mr. BLAND.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that Saturday, April 7, commencing at 1 o'clock, be set apart for exercises in commemoration of the life, character, and death of the late Mr. BLAND, of Missouri. Is there objection? There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

And then, on motion of Mr. HEMENWAY, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8347) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes, with Mr. SHERMAN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read from the point where he suspended last evening.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

Of the foregoing amounts appropriated under public buildings and grounds, the sum of \$27,130 shall be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

Mr. MUDD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a point of order against the clause just read, from lines 20 to 23, inclusive. I do not know whether the gentleman who is in charge of this bill contends that that provision is in order or not.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I certainly do.

Mr. MUDD. Mr. Chairman, I want to be heard briefly. I will read the language against which I make the point of order:

Of the foregoing amounts appropriated under public buildings and grounds, the sum of \$27,130 shall be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

It seems to me that there can be no doubt that this is squarely a change of existing law, inasmuch as it changes the fund out of which these expenses shall be paid.

I do not know that there is any permanent statute on this subject, but in the appropriation bill for the current year, passed at the last session, which I have before me and to which it is unnecessary to refer, everybody knows that these expenses were paid entirely out of the revenues of the General Government.

Now, these parks which are referred to here all belong to the General Government. The title to the land is in the General Government. It is just as appropriate and just as fair and proper that the expenses of policing this Capitol building should be paid one-half out of the revenues of the District of Columbia as to have the District pay one-half of the salaries of watchmen in the various parks hereinbefore enumerated. For instance, among the parks here enumerated as a part of the public grounds of this Government are the grounds about the Executive Mansion, the greenhouses, and nurseries, and other matters of that kind, with which the District has nothing whatever to do. It is just as appropriate and just as much in accordance with law that the Territory of Oklahoma should be made to pay one-half of these expenses as that the District of Columbia should be made to do so.

If there is no general statute upon this subject, Mr. Chairman,

then this is new legislation which changes the body of the law applicable to this subject-matter as it stands to-day. Therefore it is subject to the point of order.

Numerous decisions hold that anything which is in the nature of new legislation is a change of existing law.

Not only is this provision obnoxious to clause 2 of Rule XXI, as a change of existing law, but as to the District of Columbia and its revenues it is an expenditure not authorized by law, because everyone will concede that no such expenditure as this has ever been authorized or was ever sought to be authorized out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

I think there can be no question, Mr. Chairman, that this is a plain, unequivocal, and incontestable change of existing law and, as to the District of Columbia, also unauthorized by previous law.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's point of order is not, in my opinion, well taken, for the following reasons: Congress is the common council for the District of Columbia and has been from the time of its establishment. Its establishment is in pursuance of a provision in the Constitution. Now, it is a question of fact as to whether these are legitimate municipal expenditures. If so, then there is no doubt about the power to appropriate for the same by Congress.

The gentleman says that the District of Columbia does not own these parks. That is true. Nor does the District of Columbia own the fee in the streets. It owns the parks just as much as it does the streets.

Now, I apprehend it will not be controverted even by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MUDD] that it is competent to appropriate, either from the Federal Treasury or from the Federal Treasury as it is replenished by taxation upon property in the District of Columbia, to improve and care for the streets.

There is a great park system connected with the District. There is the Zoological Park; there is the Rock Creek Park; there are hundreds of little parks at the intersection of streets, at almost every street corner.

Now, it is true that in large part the appropriations for the care and preservation of the numberless little parks about the District have been made heretofore from the Federal Treasury alone. I mean the appropriations have been made from the Treasury as contradistinguished from the revenues of the District. But under the law of 1878, as well as under prior laws, all revenues collected in the District of Columbia are covered into the Treasury, and there is no way to get them out except to appropriate them. This bill does that, and it provides in substance, as is usual in District expenditures, that one-half shall be paid from the Treasury proper and one-half from the money that is in the Treasury from the revenues of the District of Columbia.

Now, if there is no authority to make this appropriation for policing these parks out of the revenues of the District, there is no authority to make it from the moneys belonging to the United States.

It is true that the act of 1878 does provide that it shall be the duty of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to submit estimates to be transmitted through the Secretary of the Treasury to Congress for certain objects. I read now from section 3 of that act:

The cost of maintaining public institutions of charity, prisons belonging to or controlled wholly or in part by the District, the expenses of the Aqueduct and its appurtenances, and also to submit an estimate of the amount necessary to defray the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia.

Now, this is to defray an expense of the government of the District of Columbia.

Then, if you go further on in this section, you find this provision:

To the extent to which Congress shall approve of said estimates Congress shall appropriate the amount of 50 per cent thereof, and the remaining 50 per cent of such estimates shall be levied and assessed upon the property of the District of Columbia.

The gentleman might say that as an estimate is provided for, unless the estimate comes, there could be no appropriation of one-half from the revenues of the District now in the Treasury. If the gentleman does say that, I will answer his proposition by saying that by virtue of the same language there could be no appropriation from the money of the United States in the Treasury, because the law applies to one as well as to the other; and if it applies to one, it necessarily applies to the other.

The true principle is that if this be a legitimate municipal expenditure for the District of Columbia, whether it is found in the estimates or not, under the law which creates the District and makes Congress the common council thereof, then from the bare fact of the existence of the District of Columbia, and Congress being the common council, and it being a municipal expenditure, it is in order.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. BABCOCK. The parks, as I understand it, are under the control of the War Department, and not under the control of the District Commissioners?

Mr. CANNON. Precisely.

Mr. BABCOCK. Now, another question. Is the gentleman in favor of the pending proposition?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, undoubtedly.

Mr. BABCOCK. Another question. Does the gentleman think that it is wise that all expenditures in the District of Columbia for municipal affairs and improvements should be paid one-half by the District of Columbia and one-half by the General Government?

Mr. CANNON. Yes, and no; both, if the gentleman will allow me. I am fully in harmony with the proposition that when real-estate speculators desire to have streets extended they should pay the benefits, and I believe that is a District matter and that Congress has the power to provide for the extension, just as it did the other day in the legislation that the gentleman reported, to extend one of these avenues—perhaps Sixteenth street, I do not recollect—and that that should be at the exclusive expense of the District of Columbia and of the property benefited. Congress so legislated.

Mr. BABCOCK. That is the point that I wanted to develop. Does the gentleman understand that in these street-openings, as the District pays one-half and the abutting property pays one-half?

Mr. CANNON. Very well; that is quite in the power of Congress, and Congress has so exercised the power.

Mr. BABCOCK. The impression has gone out that the District is paying it all, and I desire here to correct that, and to call attention to the fact that the District of Columbia pays for one-half of the expense of opening all of the streets and the abutting property pays the other half, it being assessed against the property, payable in one, two, three, four, and five years.

Mr. CANNON. I understand that exactly; and that is quite in the power of Congress. Further, it would be in the power of Congress, if the Chair will indulge me in further answer to the gentleman's question, to assess the whole of the expense upon the property. We have plenary power in the premises, and we have exercised it. We have had such legislation, and we will have to do so in the future where proper cases are presented; but this is upon a different ground. Here are a hundred parks, created as much for the benefit of the District of Columbia and the whole people as the streets are created. The fee simple in the streets and in the parks are all in the United States. Now, the gentleman says because of that this provision is susceptible or amenable to a point of order that one-half of it shall not be from the revenues of the District that are in the Treasury of the United States. That point of order necessarily would run upon the same principle to improvements of the streets; necessarily so. It would necessarily run upon the same principle for the support of the local courts; it would necessarily, upon the same principle, run for the support of the hospitals.

Mr. STEELE. For the police.

Mr. CANNON (continuing). And many other municipal expenditures. So, I state again, as to the District of Columbia, Congress having plenary power, Congress has legislated by the organization of the District prior to 1878 and in 1878, and has plenary power to govern this city just the same as a common council of a city would; more than that, it has greater power than a common council, because a common council finds its warrant of authority in the act of the legislature which creates it. We find our warrant of authority in the Constitution, and are absolutely supreme in the exercise of that warrant of authority, limited only by the general provisions of the Constitution.

We have exercised that authority; we have organized the District; we have created the streets; we have created the parks; we have kept the fee simple in the hands of the United States for obvious reasons. We created the Zoological Park, which has been kept in the same way, for obvious reasons; and yet the gentleman says, because the bare legal title is in the United States, that we have not power to appropriate, or rather we have not authorized heretofore appropriations for municipal purposes where the United States holds the fee simple. Well, I would point to a long line of precedents in answer to that; I point to the necessity in answer to it; I would point to legislation in answer to it; not only the legislation of 1878, I would refer to legislation from the beginning.

Mr. MUDD. Mr. Chairman, I realize, and all admit, that Congress is the common council of the District of Columbia; but I also contend, and I think all will admit, that Congress, when acting in that capacity, must act in obedience to the law and the rules of this House. I do not contend that it is not within the power of Congress to provide that the District of Columbia shall be made to pay one-half of the expenditures for the maintenance of these parks. I do not contend that Congress can not provide that the District of Columbia shall pay all the expenses of these

parks, however inequitable and wrong that may be. I do not contend that Congress, in its absolute and unlimited power of legislation on the District of Columbia, can not provide that the District of Columbia should pay the expenditures for the maintenance of this Capitol building, because it is a public building in the same sense as those here enumerated are public buildings and public grounds. But everybody realizes that there is a difference in doing this by direct legislation and doing it upon an appropriation bill. We can bring in a bill here which is not subject to a point of order in such a way as direct legislation can appropriately get before this House and directly provide by law that such should be the case; but we have not done so—

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question there?

Mr. MUDD. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. If we have not power to appropriate from the moneys in the Treasury, one half of it belonging to the people of the United States and the other half made by the District revenues, for this purpose, will my friend please put his finger on any legislation anywhere that would give us the power to appropriate it all from the moneys of the people of the United States? And I will say further that when he will put his finger on such legislation I will show him right along with it the same power to appropriate half and half.

Mr. MUDD. Mr. Chairman, I do not contend that there is a line upon the statute books specifically showing in *ipsis verbis* that you can appropriate for the general purposes and objects of the General Government. No such particular and express provision is necessary. I aver that Congress is clothed with the general power and with complete power to appropriate money generally for the expenses of the National Government, and among the objects of expenditure of the National Government is the maintenance of its public buildings, parks, and grounds.

The gentleman is unfortunate in his attempted analogy between the streets of Washington and these public parks. He replies, in response to a remark by me that on general principles outside of the law such expenditures should be paid from the Government revenues because the fee is in the Government, that the same argument would apply to the streets, and reads from the organic act of 1878. Now, Mr. Chairman, if I needed any confirmation of my contention, the gentleman has there supplied it. The organic act of 1878 does specifically provide that one-half of the expenditures for the maintenance of streets should be out of the District revenue. It goes further—

Mr. PUGH. Will the gentleman allow me an interruption?

Mr. MUDD. Certainly.

Mr. PUGH. In whose province is it to determine what constitutes the expenses for the District? Is it not solely within the discretion of Congress? And also tell me what the difference is between the principle involved in the expenses of the court of appeals, the supreme court, the Garfield Hospital, the Providence Hospital, the Zoological Park, and this.

Mr. MUDD. I understand it is in the province of Congress to determine what are the legitimate expenditures for the District of Columbia, but I understand just as well, and I apprehend that it is patent to everyone, that it is within the jurisdiction of the Chairman of this Committee of the Whole House—and it is to that jurisdiction I am now making my appeal—to determine whether or not in the case in point that function is being exercised in consonance with the law and the rules of the House.

The act of 1878 enumerates—and it is singular that the chairman should read from the act of 1878; he seems to have mistaken the application of it—I say the act of 1878 specifies the objects of expenditure for municipal purposes for which payment should be made on the half-and-half principle out of the two funds, those of the District of Columbia and the National Government. It states that the opening of streets shall be so paid—

Mr. CANNON. Oh, no. I will read it to my friend.

Also the cost of constructing, repairing, and maintaining all bridges authorized by law across the Potomac River within the District of Columbia; the cost of maintaining all public institutions of charity, reformatories, and prisons belonging to or controlled wholly or in part by the District of Columbia, and which are now by law supported wholly or in part by the United States or District of Columbia; and also the expenses of the Washington Aqueduct and its appurtenances; and also an itemized statement and estimate of the amount necessary to defray the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the next fiscal year.

Mr. MUDD. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have not the act before me—

Mr. CANNON. Neither streets nor parks are mentioned.

Mr. MUDD. I have not the act before me, but my recollection is clear that somewhere in that act there is a general provision referring to the opening and construction and extension of streets. If that is not the case, everyone understands that the opening and extension and building of streets is an ordinary municipal function.

Mr. CANNON. Now, if my friend will allow me, because we

both want to get at the right of it, take Pennsylvania avenue, down there by the market and Ford's old theater, there is a little park. Now, then, is it not both for the use of the Government and citizens of the District of Columbia, one as much as the other? If you find the authority to appropriate for one, have you not found the authority to appropriate for the other?

Mr. MUDD. Mr. Chairman, in the last Congress there was an act providing for the control by the District Commissioners of the little plats of ground at the intersection of streets which are generally denominated "parkings." I apprehend, in view of the passage of that act, if it should be the case now that there were any expenditure needed for watchmen in connection with the little places called parkings, which are not in any sense public parks, Congress might appropriate one-half out of the revenue of the District of Columbia. Now, sir, I do not feel it necessary to enter into a controversy with the gentleman as to whether or not the care of streets is especially enumerated as one of the objects of municipal concern and municipal expenditure. I know this, however, that Congress, the District Commissioners, the attorney for the District, and everybody else have heretofore so construed it to be a law; and if they have construed it to be the law and it is the law, it would require a change of existing law to appropriate for such proposition as is contained in this bill.

Nobody has ever contended that the maintenance of the public parks should be saddled on the District of Columbia. The mere fact that the citizens in this District, in common with persons temporarily residents of the District, members of Congress and others, people from all over the country, occasionally enjoy the parks is no reason why these parks should be maintained by the District of Columbia. It might just as well be contended that it was equitable and lawful that the State governments should pay one-half of the expenditure for maintenance of the great national parks that are scattered here and there throughout the country. Of course I understand that we can not make the States pay for them, but the principle, the equity, would be the same.

Mr. PUGH. Does the gentleman concede that the act of 1878 comprises all the law regulating this appropriation?

Mr. MUDD. No, sir; I understand that Congress has from time to time covered the statute book with laws regulating appropriations for the District of Columbia, but I understand just as well as the gentleman from Kentucky understands it—

Mr. PUGH. One moment.

Mr. MUDD. Let me answer the question. There is no provision in any of these laws, and the gentleman does not undertake to point to any provision requiring the expenditure by the District for this particular proposition, for the first time sought to be put through upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. PUGH. Will the gentleman—

Mr. MUDD. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that this matter will be further elucidated by any other interruption. I will therefore proceed to conclude my remarks upon it. The question here is not whether this may not be from a certain standpoint of observation a legitimate appropriation for the District of Columbia. I think it is not. But however that may be, the question and only question to be considered at present is whether this provision does not change existing law in that it proposes to change the method of appropriation—that we are to put this provision upon the statute books for the first time this year, making a departure from existing law and from the uniform custom of Congress with respect to the District for perhaps a hundred years.

The very title of this bill, "A bill making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government," shows its character and nature and purpose. Of course, it is not stated specifically in the title that the money appropriated by the bill shall come out of funds in the United States Treasury for National Government purposes—

Mr. HEMENWAY. The gentleman will allow me to say that the closing words of the title are "and for other purposes."

Mr. MUDD. Oh, I understand that; but it does not anywhere say that you are taking this money from other sources—from illegal sources.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Is not one-half of the pay of the Metropolitan police of this city to be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia?

Mr. MUDD. We will cross that bridge when we come to it. The question of the gentleman has no relation to this matter of the public parks, for which there is no provision under existing law.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Nine-tenths of this money is to be paid to officers who are clothed with the powers of the Metropolitan police.

Mr. MUDD. I do not think that is the case. If it were, it would not alter the situation. Mr. Chairman, I say again that the very title of the act in which we find this provision is a sufficient answer to the contention of gentlemen who think this proposition in order.

Let me read the first paragraph of the bill:

Be it enacted, etc. That the following sums be, and the same are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Of course, that does not specifically negative the idea that it may not refer to money in the Treasury to the credit of the District of Columbia; but I submit that by all fair rules of construction we have a right to have considered as superimposed upon and read into that language, after the word Treasury, the words "of the United States for United States Government purposes." The language as it stands in the bill constitutes, in my judgment, a fair intendment to that effect, and should be read and construed as a mandate that the moneys expended under the bill shall be drawn exclusively from funds belonging to the United States.

This is a very important question, Mr. Chairman. This provision of the bill makes a new departure. The amount of money involved is considerable. Our action upon this question will set a very important precedent, greatly affecting the welfare of the District of Columbia. Therefore, I have made the point of order, and I trust this matter will receive the very careful and serious consideration of yourself and of members of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understands it, the point of order raised by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MUDD] is, that the provision to exclude which the point of order is invoked is a change of existing law. The gentleman confines his point of order to that.

Mr. MUDD. The Chair will allow me a moment. I contend that it is a change of existing law and quoad the District of Columbia provides for an expenditure not previously authorized. My point includes both grounds.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, that amounts to practically the same thing. Clearly this provision is for a work now in progress. The gentleman from Maryland does not contend, as the Chair understands, that it is not so. The parks, according to the understanding of the Chair, are not on a parity with the Capitol Grounds, but are rather similar to the streets of the city. The organic act of 1878 clearly intended, and in section 5 rather more clearly than in section 2 states, that Congress should charge one-half of all public expenses in the District to the District of Columbia. Section 5 of the act expressly names "streets and sewers and any other work." So that the Chair thinks it was clearly the intention of Congress, by that organic act, to provide that Congress should charge the District of Columbia with one-half of all public expenses in the District. And this, it seems to the Chair, is such an expenditure as Congress intended by the act of 1878 should be borne one-half by the District of Columbia. The Chair therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. MUDD. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk. The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the word "dollars," in line 19, page 79, down to and including "Columbia," in line 23.

Mr. MUDD. As a member of the District Committee, to whose hands have been committed in a special sense the interests of this District, and with what knowledge I have of the conditions obtaining here, I have felt it my duty to offer this amendment, which proposes to strike out this provision and leave the expenses for these parks to be paid hereafter, as heretofore, entirely out of the revenues of the General Government.

I do not intend to go into any lengthy discussion of this question. The House understands the nature of the provision and the nature of the amendment. Whatever may be the opinion of the Chair (to which, of course, I submit, though I protest very strenuously that it is not the correct construction as to the legality of the provision under our rules), the propriety of the provision stands on a different footing. Everybody admits—the gentleman in charge of this bill, in discussing the point of order, conceded—that the provision is at any rate a departure from the custom that has prevailed heretofore.

Now, I have seen it stated, and I have no doubt all members of this House have made careful observation of the statements of the newspapers within the last two or three days, that the District of Columbia is now approaching a very large deficit in its revenues that are needed for carrying on the ordinary expenditures of the government and for the ordinary, gradual, and average extension of streets, in response to the interests and necessities of this, as we hope, growing city. This provision is a departure from the spirit of the organic act of 1878. By that act Congress abolished the previously existing government of the District of Columbia, took the charge of it out of the hands of its people and established the system under which the District of Columbia was to be governed exclusively by Congress without having any say in its own concerns. Congress then said, and pledged the faith of the Government to the declaration, that thereafter the expenditures of the city, which were enumerated, and which did not embrace the parks, would be paid one half out of the revenues of the General Government and the other half out of the revenue of the District of Columbia.

Certainly it was never contemplated that the District should pay one-half of the expenses of these parks. It was never so stated; it was never hinted at. It appears nowhere upon the face of that act, either by express language or by any sort of implication. It has never been contended by anyone, from that time up to this hour, that the District should pay these expenses.

The District is not able to pay these expenses. It is imposing a hardship and a burden upon the District of Columbia that it can not bear. It will cripple the growth of the District; it will curtail its capacity for needed expenditures. It is, in my judgment, unwise legislation; it is unjust legislation, and I hope that amendment will prevail, and that we will leave this matter as it has been heretofore.

Mr. HEMENWAY. The gentleman has stated that this thing has never been before this House. At the last session of this Congress on the sundry civil bill a similar provision passed—

Mr. MUDD. Passed the House.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Passed the House.

Mr. MUDD. But it was stricken out in the Senate.

Mr. HEMENWAY. The gentleman says it is not enumerated in the act of 1878. Neither are the streets enumerated.

Mr. MUDD. I contend that they are.

Mr. HEMENWAY. So that if everything had to be enumerated the General Government would have to pay for maintaining the streets of the city of Washington.

Now, what is it we have here? We are providing for a lot of watchmen in the different parks in this city. They are men clothed with police powers. They are placed there in order to protect citizens of the District of Columbia, as well as visitors and members of Congress, who are passing through these parks at night. They are virtually policemen here in the District of Columbia. Then, there are laborers who take care of the flower gardens in parks around the city. Colonel Bingham, who has charge of the public buildings and grounds, recommends that this amount be paid out of the funds of the District of Columbia, and says it is a proper charge upon the funds collected from the taxpayers of the District.

Who is there in this House that can doubt for a moment that the maintenance of the streets and the pay of the Metropolitan police are proper charges to be paid one-half by the District of Columbia? If that is so, then this is a proper charge. There can certainly be no doubt about it.

The Government does not want the District of Columbia to pay a cent that it ought not to pay, and this is a charge, as I say, a great portion of it, for the police force to guard parks around the city.

Mr. MUDD. The little parks around the city do not have watchmen or laborers either.

Mr. HEMENWAY. The gentleman says the little parks around the city do not have watchmen or laborers either. I should like to ask who makes these flower gardens, if the laborers do not do it.

Mr. MUDD. I refer to the little parkings under the control of the District Commissioners. And, if the gentleman contends that the expenditures for these parks should be borne as ordinary municipal expenditures, to be paid out of the District revenues, like other municipal expenditures, ought not these parks then to be under the control of the District Commissioners, instead of under the control of the War Department?

Mr. HEMENWAY. Why, certainly not.

Mr. CANNON. They are all creatures of Congress.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Certainly not. The original act provides what shall be under the control of the Commissioners, and what under the control of the General Government.

Mr. MUDD. And what should be paid by them, too.

Mr. HEMENWAY. And there is no reason why a policeman on a beat down here, called a watchman, who is there to protect the lives of the people, the same as the Metropolitan policemen are here to protect their lives, should not be paid just as the Metropolitan policemen are paid, unless, as the gentleman says, he is under the control of some one else. What is the difference? Who is he under the control of? Congress has to make the appropriation, whether he is under the control of Colonel Bingham or under the control of the police board here in the city. He performs exactly the same duties, except that he performs the additional duty of a watchman in the park; and he certainly ought to be paid one-half from the funds of the District and one-half from the funds of the Government; and I hope, gentlemen, that there will be no great division upon this point. The committee are certainly right. This amount ought to be divided, and paid one-half out of the funds of the District; and I hope that the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Chairman, I can not agree with my colleague on the Committee on the District of Columbia in support of his amendment. It seems to me that these are properly part of the expenditures of the District that legitimately come within the

provision which requires them to be paid one-half out of the revenues of the Government and one-half out of the revenues of the District.

But the particular point in which I wish to take issue with my colleague is the statement he makes in regard to a deficit in the revenues of the District of Columbia.

Mr. MUDD. I only state it from the newspapers. I do not know personally.

Mr. COWHERD. I am not taking issue as to whether there is or probably will be a deficit, but to as whether there ought to be a deficit.

I make the assertion that if the District of Columbia assesses and collects its taxes upon anything like the same basis that taxes are collected in all other cities in the United States, there would be no danger of any deficit in the revenues, and I wish to state that upon a hearing before a subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia in the last Congress the gentleman in charge of the assessment and collection of taxes, when the question was put to him as to why certain property was omitted from taxation, made the statement that there was no need to collect additional revenues for the District of Columbia, because they collected more now than Congress would meet by appropriation.

Mr. MUDD. That is not sufficient now, though.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COWHERD], who evidently is familiar with the subject, whether it is not a common practice in the District of Columbia to allow personal property to escape taxation?

Mr. COWHERD. That is the very proposition to which I was referring.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Does not the law provide that personal property in the District of Columbia shall be taxed?

Mr. COWHERD. I so understand it, excepting an exemption of, I think, \$500 worth of personal property.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. May I ask the gentleman why his committee does not report some measure which will make effective the law taxing property in the District of Columbia?

Mr. COWHERD. That is a question that I can not answer, as I am not in charge of the committee. The matter was under consideration in the last Congress, when a subcommittee was appointed; but the subcommittee, as I understand it, did not report.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I want to state to the gentleman an instance which came under my observation, of an estate which had existed in the District of Columbia for many years, an estate of over \$300,000, and had never paid a cent of taxation upon its personal property; and I was told in that connection that the personal property taxation law in this District was a farce; that it was not enforced and was not intended to be enforced.

It is a matter which interests us as Representatives. We must appropriate for one-half of the expenses of the District out of the National Treasury, and then have gentlemen find fault because we ask the District of Columbia to pay one-half of the expenses of public parks, which are intended for the sole benefit of the District of Columbia, when we all over the country have to pay the whole of similar expenses.

Mr. COWHERD. I heartily agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts, and it was to voice that sentiment that I took the floor.

As I understand the situation in the District of Columbia, personal property practically escapes taxation, and it escapes taxation, as I understand it, as stated by the gentleman in charge of the assessment and collection of taxes in this District, because they do not believe they need any more revenues, for the reason that they have as much now as Congress will meet by appropriation.

Mr. MUDD. Do I understand the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COWHERD] to state that there is anything approaching a general exemption of personal property from taxation by the Commissioners without warrant of law in this District?

Mr. COWHERD. I do not know whether it is by the Commissioners or by the action of the special officer in charge of that department, or how. But I do say that the practical effect is that personal property in the District of Columbia goes untaxed; that practically all the taxes are borne by real estate.

Mr. MUDD. I do not agree with the gentleman as to the matter of fact. I know that property of various forms escapes taxation in other places besides the District of Columbia; but I deny that it is a general proposition applicable to personal property in the District of Columbia.

The question being taken on agreeing to the amendment of Mr. MUDD, the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Bureau of Supplies and Accounts: For chief clerk, \$2,000; 3 clerks of class 4; 6 clerks of class 3; 2 clerks of class 2; 2 stenographers, at \$1,400 each; 11 clerks of class 1; 5 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 1 assistant messenger; 1 messenger boy, \$420; and 1 laborer; in all, \$40,200.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 88, in lines 10 and 11, strike out the words "forty thousand two hundred" and insert "forty-two thousand six hundred."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Indian Office: For the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, \$4,000; Assistant Commissioner, who shall also perform the duties of chief clerk, \$3,000; financial clerk, \$2,000; chief of division, \$2,000; principal bookkeeper, \$1,800; 5 clerks of class 4; 14 clerks of class 3; draftsman, \$1,600; stenographer, \$1,600; stenographer, \$1,400; 10 clerks of class 2; 25 clerks of class 1; 14 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 1 stenographer and 1 clerk to superintendent of Indian schools, at \$1,000 each; 17 copyists, architect, \$1,500; draftsman, \$1,500; 1 messenger; 2 assistant messengers; 2 laborers; female messenger, \$840; messenger boy, \$360; and 2 charwomen; in all, \$132,380.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if you will pass H. R. No. 1, the proclaimed purpose being to firmly establish the gold standard, you should be willing that its defects be pointed out and so amended in other respects as to best meet the requirements of the people. This bill turns over to the banks the power to control the issue of bank notes. This should not be so; it should be reserved to the people and lodged with Congress.

When a bank is chartered to furnish the currency on which the people depend to do business, it should be required to issue the full limit of bank notes authorized, and then all power should be taken from it to reduce the circulation. If you grant, as this bill does, to the national banks the right to issue the currency, much or little, as they please, and the further power to withdraw and restrict the circulation at their own will and pleasure, you open up the most perfect opportunity for combinations, and self-interest will bring about these combinations, and you will find the powerful machinery of the national banks combined to control the amount of circulation when it is their pleasure to restrict the circulation and bring about hard times and panics, to the destruction of all business save that of the banks alone.

I say to you, my Republican brethren, who have this bill in charge and are responsible for it, in the passage of this bill you make it possible for one of the greatest combines ever entered into, and you will see a trust formed that will cause all others, as disastrous as they may be and have been, to pale into utter insignificance.

Trusts are to-day the menace of this Republic. Under Republican legislation a system of combines and trusts has grown up that controls all forms of business. I say under Republican legislation; yes, the natural and legitimate outgrowth of the legislation of the Republican party.

In 1898 there were new trusts of nearly \$1,000,000,000 formed. There was in amount of stock issued the enormous sum of \$873,263,000, and the companies issued bonds for \$42,913,000 more; total, \$916,176,000. The companies' names and their capitalizations are a matter of public record.

The trusts were greatly on the increase during the year 1899. On March 26 a list of the trusts, including 162, was published in the New York World, aggregating the enormous sum of \$2,683,164,467.

Prior to this, J. Pierpont Morgan had succeeded in combining eight railroads in his gigantic coal trusts, with a capitalization of \$839,108,756.

Mr. Whitney has also consolidated 22 street-car lines in New York in six years and made for the stockholders \$119,000,000. He has also an electric monopoly in New York City with a capital of \$25,000,000.

The trusts controlled by the Rockefellers are as follows:

Standard Oil	\$97,250,000
Federal Trust	98,000,000
Cotton oil	30,435,700
Sugar refining	73,936,000
American tobacco	35,534,000
Copper	50,000,000
Glucose	37,086,900
Consolidated gas	36,230,000
Total	458,461,700

Meanwhile such men are constantly evading taxes, and thus doubly plunder the public. [Applause.]

With the opportunity for making millions without risk and with but small investment of capital, it is not surprising that when a political party came into power which allowed this wholesale system of robbery trusts should spring up as plentiful as blackberries in July. The first effect of these trusts is to create what appears to be prosperity. The owners of the mills and the stockholders have received cash for their holdings, and that cash is put into circulation. The people generally have money. At such times gilt-edged paper can be placed in the money centers at a small per cent. Profitable investment can not be found for money; it lies idle in the vaults. When the lines of business are well in the hands of the trusts and the individual competitors are driven from the fields of commerce and industry the reaction will come.

There will be no effort to increase trade, but all the effort will be directed toward keeping down the supply to the lowest possible point of consumption in order to secure the highest prices. A large proportion of the laboring men will be out of employment and its baneful effects do not stop with the labor class. When the avenues of individual efforts are closed and business is placed in the hands of corporations, a man with small capital can find no investment. Prices will range higher than now and the wage-earner's dollar will have less purchasing power. The man who sells his interest in a mill can no longer find profitable employment either for himself or his capital. When this condition is complete, the history of other nations teach us that the people of the country become dissatisfied and will rise in revolt.

The recent issue of the national-bank statement by the Comptroller of the Currency shows that between May 5, 1898, and April 5, 1899, there was an increase in individual deposits lying idle in the national banks of this country of \$437,914,981.33. This is a large per cent of the entire circulating medium, including all forms of money. Thus a large per cent of the money lies idle in the banks because there is no longer any avenues for individual investment. The New York Journal makes the total capitalization of all the trusts in the country, May 27, \$7,416,235,799. The capital invested in these combines increased more than 75 per cent in a little more than a month. It is more than any national debt in the world. It is seven times the bonded debt of the United States. It is \$500 for every family in the country; \$100 for every man, woman, and child in the land. The menace in these figures almost terrifies. There can be no evading the alternative before the people; either they must crush or be crushed.

Had the \$5,000,000,000 for which trusts have been capitalized during the past eighteen months been applied to the opening of new mines and the erection of new mills we would now be enjoying the greatest era of prosperity in all history, for the reason that never before have the conditions in foreign countries been so favorable for the extension of American trade. While the returns of the Bureau of Statistics of the Treasury Department show an increase of about 20 per cent in the gross exports of manufactured articles, yet when these exports are analyzed, and those deducted which have been caused solely by the war with Spain, it is found there has been, in fact, an actual decrease in the export of manufactured products.

This is a condition of affairs which every man, no matter what may have been his past political affiliations, should exert his utmost efforts to remedy. It is a serious charge to make against any political party that it has opened the doors to this system of wholesale plundering. The Republican party seeks to repudiate the charge that it has fostered or encouraged these aggregations of pelf, but the facts of history point so conclusively to it as the creator of this condition that no sensible man can doubt that the leaders are chargeable with direct knowledge if not actual participation therein. In 1868 there were but three trusts formed. In 1889 but five. These created such a protest that Congress passed the anti-trust law. Within one year after the McKinley tariff law there were put into operation 34 new trusts. During the first year of the Wilson tariff law there were but four. When the Dingley bill became a law trusts immediately became the rage, and over 200 have been put in operation.

By this act you retire the greenbacks and place the national bank above the Government itself, by charging it with furnishing the currency of the country. Add to this the terrible crime and folly of granting the national banks the right to restrict the currency and bring about hard times and panics at their will, and you will thereby complete the most wonderful blunder of the age, for which the wrath of a long-suffering people will finally overtake you. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

In connection with what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MIERS] has so well and so eloquently said regarding the power and the sway of the trusts I concur and entirely agree, and I desire at this time to say a few words concerning trusts in this country.

On the 12th, 13th, and 14th of this month there was held in Chicago an anti-trust conference. At that conference there were representatives from almost every State and Territory in the Union. There were over 1,000 delegates to that conference. It was one of the most representative bodies of men and women that ever assembled in this country, and the work it did for the common weal and against the trusts will have a beneficial effect all over this country. The anti-trust conference was a great success.

There is no doubt that the trusts to-day are doing irreparable injury to the consumers, the toilers, and the taxpayers of the

country. No one will dispute that proposition. I believe and I charge that the Administration is responsible for the sway, the growth, and the power of the trusts. If the Attorney-General would enforce the law now on the statute books, in my judgment every trust could be dissolved; and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], the spokesman of the Administration, took that position at the beginning of this session and stated on the floor of this House that the enforcement of the law would crush the trusts. The McKinley Administration is responsible for the trusts. It is owned and controlled by the trusts; it stands sponsor for them, and refuses to do anything to curb their enormous power and their centralization and absorption of wealth.

The greatest trust, however, of all the trusts is the money trust, and the present currency bill which you are about to pass will create the greatest money monopoly and the greatest financial trust the world has ever seen. Its possibilities for plunder are unlimited. This conference at Chicago condemned that gold standard currency bill; this anti-trust conference at Chicago, composed of representatives of the Republican party, of the Democratic party, of the Populist party, and of every political party in the country, unanimously condemned that Republican iniquity, the gold standard currency bill, which intends to turn over to the national banks the money of the people, and creates the greatest national-bank trust the world has ever known. A committee was appointed to bear this protest to Washington and present it to this House.

I now send to the Clerk's desk the protest unanimously adopted against this outrageous bill, and ask the Clerk to read it as part of my remarks. I want it placed on record before the bill is finally passed and sent to the President.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., February 15, 1900.

By authority of the resolution hereunto appended, I, M. L. Lockwood, chairman of the National Anti-Trust League, hereby appoint W. B. Fleming, WILLIAM SULZER, George Fred Williams, Mrs. Helen Gougar, F. E. Ridgeley, Willis J. Abbott, T. Carl Spelling, William Prentiss, J. B. Weaver, J. R. Sovereign, W. H. Harvey, J. B. Romans, J. W. Wilson, JOHN J. LENTZ, M. C. Wetmore, and C. A. Towne as said committee.

Witness my hand.

M. L. LOCKWOOD, President.

FRANKLIN H. WENTWORTH, Secretary.

Resolution unanimously passed by the anti-trust conference held at Chicago February 12, 13, and 14, 1900.

Whereas there has been passed by the House of Representatives a bill commonly known as the "currency bill," which is now pending in the Senate of the United States; and

Whereas it is proposed by said bill to further extend special and exclusive privileges to favored classes; and

Whereas said bill, if enacted into law, would surrender to the national banks the governmental function of issuing the currency; second, bestow an immense bonus upon the bondholders; third, give a bounty of many hundreds of millions of dollars to the national banks, convert standard silver dollars into mere credit money, and throw all forms of currency upon the Treasury for redemption in gold; fourth, make all debts now existing or hereafter contracted payable in gold; fifth, place in the hands of the banks the power to contract and expand the currency at will; sixth, in short, we believe the measure is calculated to establish a centralized money oligarchy, establish a powerful banking trust which will have the power to practically enslave the people, and in the end destroy the Republic: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this nonpartisan anti-trust conference, assembled in Chicago and consisting of representatives from 32 States and Territories, hereby utters its most solemn protest against the passage of this measure; and be it further

Resolved, That the chairman of this conference is hereby instructed to appoint a committee of seven or more members of this body, whose duty it shall be to immediately visit Washington for the purpose of laying this protest before the members of both Houses of Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That we warn the people of the United States against this menace to their liberties and call upon them everywhere to come together and record their emphatic protests against all such legislation.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, the committee duly came to Washington and instructed me to present to this House that protest. I concur in every word it contains. I know you laugh and sneer at it now, but it will bear fruit. I know it will not deter you from passing that outrageous bill for the national banks, but I believe in the end this mighty protest will be heard, and in the avalanche to come the cruel gold-currency bill you will soon enact will be swept from the statute books.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time be extended. This is an important matter, and I want to be heard. I will be as brief as I can.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that his time be extended. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SULZER. Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to say to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] that at the time this resolution was unanimously adopted in the anti-trust conference over a thousand delegates from all over the Union were present, and the chairman of the conference was a distinguished son of Ohio, a Republican, former attorney-general, Frank S. Monett. He was turned down by the leader of the Republican party, MARK HANNA, at the last Republican State convention in Ohio, over which, I believe, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] presided, because he had the courage of his convictions; because

he dared, as an honest, as a faithful, and as an upright attorney-general of the State of Ohio, to do his duty, and began an action against the Standard Oil trust for violating the law.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] about the anti-trust law. I think myself it is a fairly good law; but I differ with the gentleman from Ohio in regard to its enforcement. He says it is a good law; but apparently he does not believe in its enforcement. I want it enforced against every trust in the land.

In my opinion, if your Republican Attorney-General was brave enough to enforce that law, there would not be a trust in the country to-day; and if you had not turned down your honest and faithful attorney-general in Ohio, the Standard Oil trust, the greatest monopoly to-day in all the land, would be out of business and not paying 20 per cent dividends every three months on \$100,000,000 capitalization. Twenty millions of dollars dividends every quarter of a year on its capital stock, and every dollar taken from the poor people of this country. Only the other day, not satisfied with receiving a profit of \$80,000,000 every year on a capitalization of \$100,000,000, and most of that water, the Standard Oil trust raised the price of oil 1 cent a gallon.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Three cents a gallon.

Mr. SULZER. Yes, 3 cents a gallon within a short time, but 1 cent a gallon a few days ago. That means an additional profit to the Standard Oil trust of over \$10,000,000 a year, and the Republican party stands sponsor for it. [Applause.]

The law on the statute books against trusts is clear and plain, and the highest court in the land has passed on its validity and sustained the constitutionality of its provisions. The anti-trust act of 1890 declares that every contract or combination in the nature of a trust in restraint of trade and commerce among the several States and Territories or with foreign nations is a conspiracy, illegal and void, and punishable by fine and imprisonment.

Under the law of our country trusts are criminal, and there is no distinction between a so-called good trust and a so-called bad trust, between a big trust and a little trust. Every trust is contrary to both the spirit and the letter of the law. To seriously contend otherwise as a legal proposition would be preposterous. If we did so, by analogy we might as consistently assert that there were good pirates and bad pirates. If robbery is criminal, it is immaterial, so far as the crime is concerned, whether the robbery is a big one or a little one. The violation of law is the same.

Under this anti-trust act it seems to me every trust in the United States can be prosecuted for violation of law, the charter annulled, and the men behind it punished for conspiracy. Every trust by its very nature is in restraint of trade and commerce and in violation of this law.

If you will read the anti-trust act of 1890 and the decisions of the United States Supreme Court in the trans-Missouri freight case and the Addyston Pipe Line case, the conclusion will be irresistible to the logical mind that the fault is not so much with the law as it is with the men who are sworn to enforce the law. The law so far as it goes is all right—the do-nothing Attorney-General is all wrong. The imperative mandate of the day is "Enforce the law, and every trust in the country will dissolve." Whenever the trusts have been brought before the courts, and their true character shown, they have been declared illegal.

In my opinion—and I say so advisedly—the Department of Justice under the present law can institute and successfully maintain actions against every trust doing business in the United States. The law is clear and plain, and the facts are within the knowledge of all and too obvious for controversy.

I am unalterably opposed to all trusts, especially the money trust, and I solemnly warn the American people against the money monopoly and the national-bank trust—the greatest of them all—created by this Republican currency bill.

The money monopoly and the national-bank trust menace our Republic to-day. Jackson waged the most bitter and relentless war of his life against the United States Bank and finally destroyed that gigantic monopoly. If he had not, it would have destroyed the Republic. One of the greatest acts of his life was the veto of the bill extending the charter of that bank trust. In the light of what is going on to-day, that veto message should be read by every citizen in our land. The bill now pending in Congress gives to the national banks of the country far greater powers and privileges than were ever enjoyed by the United States Bank. It is a Republican bill, and the Republican party stands sponsor for it and is committed to its passage.

When it becomes a law it will give the monopoly of issuing money to the national banks, and hence the right to expand or contract the currency of the people whenever it suits their convenience. No corporation should have this power to make or destroy. It would deprive the Government of one of its greatest attributes of sovereignty and give to the national banks the right to paralyze, at their own will, every industry in the country. It is the most daring attempt the banks have ever made by law to

seize one of the greatest weapons for good or evil known to civilized man. For the Government to surrender this prerogative and delegate away this power is a crime against every citizen in this land and will work woe and misery to millions yet unborn.

I am opposed to the Government delegating away its powers to the national banks. We should vigorously oppose conferring any additional powers on or granting any greater privileges to the national banks. In my judgment they already possess entirely too much power. They are doing precisely to-day, only to a greater extent, what the United States Bank did in the days of Andrew Jackson. The right to coin and issue money is one of the greatest prerogatives of the Republic and one of the highest attributes of its sovereignty. It should not be transferred, assigned, or set over to any national bank, to any trust, or to any monopoly.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am glad to welcome this opportunity to place on record the unanimous protest against the Republican currency bill of one of the largest representative, nonpartisan gatherings ever held in this country, and I say to you, pass your bank-currency bill, establish your money monopoly—your bank trust—turn the money of the people over to the national banks, to expand or contract the currency at their will, to make times good or to make times bad, and you will hear from the people on election day; you will hear from them in the coming campaign as they march to the polls to vote for that fearless and intrepid champion of the masses, that pure and irreproachable patriot, that stalwart and gallant leader of the people, William J. Bryan. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I am not a candidate for the Vice-Presidency of the United States [laughter], and if I were I should have no opposition for that office in my own delegation. Therefore I am not excited about this trust question; but I want to point out now the sort of absurd statements that are being made by men claiming to be members of Congress and being intelligent citizens of the country.

Now, in the first place, I did talk in the beginning of this Congress a few words about the Sherman anti-trust law, and now comes the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] and says that the attorney-general of Ohio undertook to enforce the Sherman anti-trust law and war was made on the attorney-general. I pause for the House to absorb the enormous ignorance involved in that statement. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] The Sherman anti-trust law is a law of Congress, to be enforced against violators of the interstate commerce under the provisions of that act, and to be enforced by district attorneys in the United States courts, and not by the attorneys-general of States, and my friend here who goes hippodroming over the country comes back loaded with such nonsense as that. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Now, next. The Republican legislature of the State of Ohio passed what is known as the Valentine anti-trust law, applicable to the operations of trusts in the State of Ohio. Mr. Monett, as he had a right to do, as it was his duty to do, brought suits under that law in the supreme court of Ohio, and the first step toward adjudication was raised by a demurrer to the petition, raising the question of the constitutionality of the law. It was argued on one side by Mr. Virgil Kline, of Cleveland, and Mr. Neal, of my own Congressional district, both eminent lawyers, and on the other side by the attorney-general and by his assistant; and the supreme court decided by a unanimous opinion upholding the constitutionality of the law, and decreeing its enforcement against the violators of it in the State of Ohio.

Mr. SULZER. Will the gentleman permit me an interruption?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes.

Mr. SULZER. I would like to ask the gentleman, who is a distinguished Republican from the State of Ohio, why you did not renominate Mr. Monett as attorney-general?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Well, the gentleman will find that he has got his foot into that worse than he did in the other. [Laughter.] Mr. Monett has been twice elected attorney-general of Ohio, and there is an unwritten law in the politics of Ohio that, with only one or two exceptions since the formation of the Republican party, has been enforced without any sort of objection, that no man shall be elected to one of these offices more than twice. I never knew an attorney-general of that State to be three times elected. Possibly it has been done, but I think not. I was in the convention; I was not a member, not even a delegate; I was not chairman of it, but I sat and listened and saw the whole of it. Mr. Monett was not a candidate. Think of that! And now the gentleman comes back from Chicago loaded with that sort of stuff. Mr. Monett distinctly refused to announce his name as a candidate, and he received a very few votes in the convention which were given by somebody as a sort of a compliment to a bright, intelligent, capable young man. There were six or eight candidates for the place.

Now, let me summarize and see how much we get out of one of these passionate harangues.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Now, let us summarize it. The Sherman anti-trust law was passed by a Republican Congress, signed by a Republican President, lay absolutely dead on the statute book during the term of the only full-fledged Democratic Administration we have had in thirty-odd years. The very moment this Republican Administration came in it was put into active motion, and under the instrumentality of the courts of the country the trans-Missouri combination was broken up, the traffic association in New York was broken up, and the court has made a decision that holds that this very law, this Sherman anti-trust law, applies to the manufacture and sale of every commodity that is manufactured in the United States for interstate commerce by a trust. Now, what does the gentleman propose to add to that?

Mr. DALY of New Jersey. Will the gentleman permit me a question?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Certainly.

Mr. DALY of New Jersey. What part did the Attorney-General take in the prosecution of these anti-trust cases?

Mr. GROSVENOR. He argued them in the Supreme Court of the United States. It is true, my friend, that the oral argument was presented by the gentleman from Ohio, John K. Richards, the Solicitor-General, a most able lawyer and ex-attorney-general of Ohio, but it is equally true that the Attorney-General, whom you are constantly shouting at, was instrumental in pushing that prosecution just as much as the law of the country requires him to. How often has the Attorney-General gone into the Supreme Court and argued orally? Very seldom; almost never. There is no one of the prosecutions that can be carried on without the approval and direction of the Attorney-General of the United States.

While I have no particular interest in this question, and the gentleman can attack his own citizen, if he sees fit—I do not say that he has—but I have this to say about Attorney-General Griggs: A better lawyer, a clearer-headed administrator of justice, never lived in the United States than John W. Griggs, and no man can put his finger on the time or place where he has hesitated to push forward, under the proper subordinates of his office, every one of these prosecutions. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts rose.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Oh, this is not a case of the soldiers from Massachusetts. [Laughter.] So it comes about that every law on the statute book against trusts was put there by Republicans, every prosecution begun by a Republican officer, every prosecution that was ended was ended in favor of the Government, and yet the gentleman goes to Chicago and comes back loaded with that sort of stuff.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Is it not a fact that all the trusts have increased immensely during the last three years of Republican administration?

Mr. GROSVENOR. The trusts and soup houses never prosper together. [Laughter.] You will never while you live see anything prosper but poverty under Democratic administration.

Now, so much for the national part of this question. Now, I ask, how many States of this Union have anti-trust laws that are not in the hands of the Republicans?

Mr. LACEY. And is it not true that the Democratic legislature of Ohio elected Mr. Payne, of the Standard Oil Company, a Senator from that State?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Oh, yes; but we do not charge them anything for that. They do not know yet how it was done. [Laughter.]

Now, then, about MARK HANNA having defeated Mr. Monett. MARK HANNA had no more to do with the nomination or non-nomination of Mr. Monett than any gentleman on the other side of the House had. He was not a delegate to the convention; he had no interest whatever in the question of the attorney-generalship. There were half a dozen able lawyers named for the place, and one of the best of them was nominated. This same attorney-general is to-day pushing forward under the Valentine act all the prosecutions that were begun under the administration of his predecessor. The New York anti-trust law, the Ohio law, the Illinois law, all the laws of that character that I know anything about in the United States, outside of Texas, are laws which were passed in Republican States by Republican legislatures, while the Democrats were crying—

A MEMBER. There were other States besides those which the gentleman has named.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes, there may be others.

Mr. COWHERD. Missouri, for instance.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes; Missouri had one of the earliest of such laws. I admit it.

Now, the matter comes right down to this: All the States of the Union where business activity has been felt and where the evils of these trusts have become manifest have joined together and passed these anti-trust laws.

Now, let me tell the gentleman something: The man who in the campaign of 1900 undertakes to run for Vice-President or anything else upon an outcry about the trusts—howling in the ears of the American people upon that subject—does not know what the American people are made of. The American people, Mr. Chairman, understand one thing, and there can be no dispute about it; they understand that for four years—from 1892 to 1896—business broke down; they starved; everything went to destruction and disaster all over this country. [Laughter and applause.] And they know that it was not twenty-four hours after the election of 1896 before business began to revive. And they will stand by the party that stood by them.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, just a brief time to reply to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR].

Perhaps the country will accept the apology of the spokesman of the Administration for the failure of the Republican party in Ohio to renominate Attorney-General Frank S. Monett, but I doubt it. I am glad, however, to hear the spokesman of the Administration now say to the country that Frank S. Monett was an honest, a faithful, and a capable attorney-general; that he was doing his whole duty and bravely enforcing the law against the trusts.

And I desire also to say in this connection that so long as he was such a good man, such an honest official, and such a good Republican—so long as he was doing his duty so honestly, so faithfully, and so conscientiously enforcing the law against the trusts, it seems to me that the old precedent in Ohio referred to should have been turned down instead of Mr. Monett. I ask my friend to think this over carefully. It would have been better, in my opinion, for the people of Ohio and for the people of the country generally if an exception had been made in this case. The Republican party should have renominated Mr. Monett if it honestly was opposed to the Standard Oil trust and wanted the law enforced.

Mr. SHATTUC. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. SULZER. I have the floor, and I can not yield now. Perhaps, too, the country will accept the apology of the gentleman from Ohio in regard to the trusts, and MARK HANNA, the leader of the Republican party, the man who absolutely dominates it today, the man who believes in brute force, the man who does not believe in reason and persuasion, the man who believes that the American people ought to be driven hither and thither, the man who believes that all he has to do as the master is to snap the party whip and the Republicans from one end of the land to the other will march in serried ranks to the polls and vote as he dictates. But I doubt it.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] says I do not understand the American people. I think I do; I believe he does not. I know the great American heart. I believe I understand the nobler impulses of the great civilization on this hemisphere. I think I know the sentiment of the American people; I think I know what they are thinking about; I think I do know how they feel in reference to the imperial march of the Republicans under the leadership of MARK HANNA; I think I know how they feel as they witness your actions here—overriding the Constitution, trampling under foot the Declaration of Independence, and turning to the wall the picture of the great emancipator; and I prophesy now that the people of this country will never submit to the brutal dictation of either the gentleman from Ohio or his royal master—MARK HANNA. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I believe in the people, and I trust the people. Can you say that?

The protest which I offer to-day and which has just been read, coming from the source it does, coming from a large representative nonpartisan body, coming, I say, from as great a gathering of thinkers as ever assembled in this country, will have its effect. It will not stay your mad course in turning the money of the people over to the national banks and allowing them to create the greatest trust in all the world—a gigantic money trust. It will not stop you from enacting that bill into law, because you were sold to do it, sold body and soul to do that very thing by MARK HANNA, your imperial master in the campaign of 1896. He is simply keeping his promise now, and delivering the goods to the national bankers. You are the tools, the agents if you will, to register his decrees and do as he bids. What a spectacle of representative government!

Mr. Chairman, in 1896 MARK HANNA marched down Wall street, his hands stretched out like this [illustrating], collecting money from the Wall street bankers for the McKinley campaign. What a sight that was for honest people to witness. It marked a red-letter day in the history of the Republican party, the party of plutocracy.

He marched down Wall street, from Trinity Church to the Ferry, and every national banker bid him welcome, and every national banker gave most freely and most bountifully to the Republican

campaign fund—the largest by millions ever raised—to thwart the will of the people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SULZER. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the gentleman may proceed.

Mr. SHATTUC. Not unless he will answer a question.

Mr. SULZER. I will answer the gentleman's question. What is it?

Mr. SHATTUC. What business is it to you what we do in Ohio?

Mr. SULZER. Let me say to the gentleman—

Mr. SHATTUC. Let him catch his breath, Mr. Chairman. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. SULZER. There is an old saying that those who laugh last laugh best. The gentleman from Ohio asks what business it is to me what they do in Ohio. That question does the gentleman's intelligence justice. It should be remembered. I will tell him what concern I have. I want to see the imperial march of the Ohio syndicate checked and its corrupting influence crushed forever. I want to see a Democratic Representative returned in your place from Ohio next fall.

I want to see a man who laughs and sneers at the people like you beaten, because in a Government like this you deserve to be beaten. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] I want to see Ohio cast its electoral vote for the Democratic nominee for President, because I believe it will be for the best interests of all the people, and if I can judge the future by the past, and if the last election is any criterion, it will be done, and you make no mistake, Mr. Interrupter, you will not be here in the next Congress. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, sir, I want to say that the money MARK HANNA collected in Wall street in the campaign of 1896 was used to carry the country for the Republican party, and he to-day snaps the party whip over you and makes you vote for this iniquitous Republican currency bill to make good his promises in Wall street. He knows he could not pass the bill through this House unless he made you walk into a caucus and be bound by the caucus. Many of you hate to vote for the bill, but you dare not bolt the caucus of your party for fear of the vengeance of HANNA.

Mr. SHATTUC. He gets enough on your side to make up what we lose on this side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York declines to yield.

Mr. SHATTUC. How many have you got on your side that voted for the bill?

Mr. SULZER. You did not dare; you could not pass that iniquitous currency bill without making it a caucus matter. MARK HANNA whipped you Representatives into the caucus, and then whipped into line the men who had the courage to protest against its iniquitous features.

Mr. SHATTUC. The majority of your own New York delegation voted for it.

Mr. SULZER. You are mistaken. That is not so. You keep your own household clean. There are many Representatives on that side of the House who did not want to vote for the bill. It was an affront, and made them stultify their records in this House and their promises to their constituents.

A MEMBER (on the Republican side). Name them.

Mr. SULZER. They rebelled at first. They went to the President, begging and imploring him to save them, and bending the pregnant hinges of the knee. They appealed to the President not to pass the bill. They went to MARK HANNA and begged him not to pass the bill, but MARK HANNA, in effect, no doubt, told you, "We must keep our contract with the national bankers, and if we do not keep our contract with the national bankers and give the national bankers what I agreed to—the right to control the money of the people—they will not put up in 1900 as they put up in 1896." That is practically what MARK HANNA said. That is the reason this bill must pass ere this campaign begins.

Mr. SHATTUC. Whom did he say that to?

Mr. SULZER. And I imagine he said to you, "Without boodle, without the necessary wherewithal and plenty of it, we can not carry the country in 1900 any more than we could have done it in 1896."

Mr. SHATTUC. Which Congressman did he say that to?

Mr. SULZER. Now, that is the whole story, that is the secret for the passage of this gold standard currency bill, and I want you and others to read the protest I offered a little while ago carefully to-morrow. You have laughed at that protest. You have mocked the people in their misery, but the people will yet rise up and mock you. Louis XIV said—

Mr. SHATTUC. Who was Louis XIV?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is not in order.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I am not surprised at the gentleman's ignorance. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic

side.] Louis XIV mocked the people; he laughed at them and scorned them as they begged and cringed. "The State!" said the King, "I am the State." But before the grass was green on his grave the same people rose up against long-continued wrong and usurpation and said: "The State! Nay, Sire, we are the State." They drew aside the royal curtain, and all the world saw the head of a King roll in the basket.

You laugh now; you scoff at petition, and you mock the people in their woe and their misery; but let me say to you, the time is not far distant when they will rise up and you will have to render an account of your stewardship. The Republican party, intoxicated with its power, puffed up with its royal swagger, and mad with its imperialistic sway, impudently spurns the people, and arrogantly declares: "The State! The Republican party is the State."

But in the coming fall the people will rise up against Republican wrongs and Republican usurpations, and in thunder tones declare, "The State! Nay, Mr. HANNA, we are the State." They will draw aside the imperial curtain of Republican corruption, and all the world will witness the triumphant election of a Democratic President. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I merely wanted to rise for a moment to ask if the object that is near to the heart of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] and of us all has not received sufficient attention, perhaps, for one day, so that we might progress with our bill?

Mr. SULZER. I am glad the gentleman agrees with me.

Mr. CANNON. I am not exactly on all fours with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR]. I must confess to more sympathy than he has with the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER]. Perhaps the gentleman from Ohio is not informed about the operation of a great trust. I am in it. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER], who last addressed the House, is in it. He is trying to get all that side of the House in it, and I am trying to get all this side of the House in it, because it is absolutely patent that it would be a great combination.

Here is the gentleman from New York, who was created to look like the great commoner, Mr. Clay. The great commoner from Kentucky, dead and gone, has been reincarnated, so that we have my friend from New York as a foundation to go upon the ticket, to save the country, to save the party, to save the world. He comes, you know, from Tammany, and Tammany made him, and he jumps when Tammany pulls the string, and he has a tolerably hard road to travel. He has wicked Democratic colleagues from New York who were created by Tammany who did not vote with him on the "infernal, outrageous, evil-begotten, damnable" bill [laughter], and they have handicapped him, in part, because, while he jumps when Tammany pulls the string and takes much for granted in getting upon this national ticket with Mr. Bryan, he is handicapped by these gentlemen, and it is necessary for him to talk two or three times here and to go to Chicago to convince you gentlemen who are not in harmony with this wicked bill that he is not to blame for what his colleagues from New York City did, and it was necessary for him to go to Ohio, that is in the trust, to talk about trusts.

Why, this is the one trust—the nomination on the ticket with Bryan—perhaps, that ought not to come under the Sherman law or under the New York law. It is a great trust. It assembles here in the House, it runs over to New York, it journeys about with Bryan, it goes out to Chicago with Altgeld and Weaver and Mrs. Gougar, and they resolute, you know, and he bears the resolutions down and has read them to the House. Well, now, that is necessary, because he ought to go on the ticket. I am for him on the ticket. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.] He and I have agreed about it. We are working to the same end, and I appeal to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] never again to interrupt the operation of this agreement.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I promise that I never will. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON. Now, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] having made great progress and having got into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the sayings of that wise, nonpartisan body that met at Chicago, headed by Altgeld, Weaver, and Mrs. Gougar, and where my friend shone across the continent and the seas like a beacon in the storm, battling for the rights of humanity and of all the people and the rest of mankind, I think we have done enough for one day, and next Monday, immediately after the reading of the Journal, I will stand by the gentleman from New York in a demand for an hour and will hold up his arms in carrying out our agreement. But I think now it would not be apt to go on much longer to-day, because we had better do a little public business to fool the people. [Prolonged laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, just a word. I am not responsible for anyone on the floor of this House but myself. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] may laugh at the protest of the people, and his colleagues may spurn it with contempt, but

that protest will be heard when many of the gentlemen on that side of the House are retired to private life and meditating on the power of the people.

The Clerk read as follows:

For an additional force of 150 special examiners for one year, at a salary of \$1,300 each, \$195,000, and no person so appointed shall be employed in the State from which he is appointed; and any of those now employed in the Pension Office or as special examiners may be reappointed if they be found to be qualified.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I suppose that the delightful witticism of the gentleman from Illinois—

Mr. HEMENWAY. I raise the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing the amendment pending. I want to serve notice now that we must transact the public business. We must read this bill, and so much time has been occupied that it will take almost the balance of the day to read it. I hope gentlemen will not insist upon further general discussion. We have had two days of general discussion, and nearly all of yesterday was taken by general discussion, and the bill must be read and passed.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I think the gentleman could well have afforded to withhold until at least a commentary had been made upon the remarks made by the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. If the point of order is insisted upon, the Chair must sustain it.

Mr. GAINES. I hope the gentleman will withdraw his point of order, or insist on it regularly and enforce it.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. GAINES. To complain of the unfair administration of the rules of this House by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HEMENWAY]. The gentleman raises the point of order against general debate when a gentleman on this side of the House rises to address the House—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is not in order.

Mr. GAINES (continuing). And when a Republican rises he does not object, but permits general debate. That is the point I make.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee at that time had no right to make any point, because the gentleman from Tennessee had not the floor for any purpose.

Mr. GAINES. It is the unfair administration of the rules that I protest against; the maladministration of even a bad rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is not in order, and will take his seat.

Mr. GAINES. "The gentleman from Tennessee" will take his seat, but I do not propose that this side of the House shall be run over by anybody by an unfair administration of the rules of this House without a protest.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I am at a loss to understand how the gentleman so speedily arrived at the conclusion that my remarks were out of order. I certainly had not uttered ten words when he made the interruption.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana made his suggestion rather as a warning than otherwise.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I may take it that the ruling of the Chair was also a warning. I supposed that would have to be based upon something said by me.

The CHAIRMAN. It certainly would. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I will say frankly that my purpose was to devote five minutes to some comments upon the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing the amendment pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. TERRY. Why did you not make that point of order when your side was up?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. It was a manifestation of that customary discretion of the person in charge of the bill to act as a rear guard to the wits of the Republican side of the House.

Mr. HEMENWAY. The gentleman certainly can not charge that I have been unfair, as his side of the House has done most of the talking.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I noticed on yesterday that the gentleman served notice that he would make the point of order, but he did not make it when the gentleman from Illinois was addressing the committee.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I wanted the other side to have their share.

The Clerk read as follows:

For surveyor-general of Nevada, \$1,800; and for the clerks in his office, \$1,500; in all, \$3,300.

For rent of office for the surveyor-general, pay of messenger, fuel, stationery, post-office box rent, draftsmen's requisites, fuel, binding records, and other incidental expenses, \$500.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, in line 25, page 106, and line 1, page 107, by striking out "one thousand eight hundred" and inserting "two thousand;" in line 2, page 107, by striking out "three hundred" and inserting "five hundred;" in lines 6 and 7, page 107, by striking out "five" and inserting "seven."

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment changes existing law.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I would like the gentleman to state in what respect it changes existing law?

Mr. HEMENWAY. It increases the salary; it increases the amount provided.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would inquire of the gentleman from Nevada, is there any statute other than an appropriation bill which provides this salary?

Mr. NEWLANDS. There is a statute—section 2210 of the Revised Statutes—which fixes the salary of the surveyor-general of the State of Nevada at \$3,000. Since that time, by various acts of Congress, in appropriation bills only, the salary was reduced in 1880—or, rather, not reduced—but the appropriation was made in 1880 for only \$2,500. In 1886 the appropriation was made for \$1,800 only. There is authority of law for a salary of \$3,000.

The CHAIRMAN. On the statement of the gentleman from Nevada, the point of order is not well taken.

Mr. HEMENWAY. This salary has been appropriated for at this amount ever since 1876. I want to call attention to the fact that the amendment of the gentleman from Nevada does not propose to make it the statutory amount. He proposes to raise the amount appropriated for this office.

Mr. NEWLANDS. It is within the statutory limit.

Mr. HEMENWAY. And inasmuch as it does not raise it to the statutory limit I think it is certainly a change of existing law.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the law, this officer will be entitled to \$3,000, upon the statement of the gentleman from Nevada that the Revised Statutes provides that salary; and it seems to me—

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman is correct the amendment is in order.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I suggest to my friend that he had better compromise at \$2,000, because the point of order is made by him and it will result in the salary being raised to the statutory amount.

Mr. HEMENWAY. We decline to compromise, for the reason that when Mr. Randall was at the head of the Appropriations Committee in 1876 this salary was decreased to this amount. It is a sufficient amount for the services performed, and I make the point of order that the amendment changes existing law.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It was decreased only by the appropriation bills.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has before him section 2210 of the Revised Statutes, which provides that "the surveyors-general of Colorado, New Mexico, California, Idaho, Nevada, Montana, Utah, Wyoming, and Arizona shall each receive a salary at the rate of \$3,000 a year." That being so, the fact that in subsequent appropriation bills less than that sum was appropriated does not change the statute, and so far as it relates to Nevada the point of order is overruled.

Mr. NEWLANDS. The other portion of the amendment which I offered is in relation to the office rent and incidental expenses. I ask to have that raised to \$700.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would suggest to the gentleman from Nevada that he divide his amendment.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will do so.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I suggest that the point of order is made to the whole amendment, and ought to be sustained.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will withdraw my amendment as offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nevada can modify his amendment, which he now does.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Then, Mr. Chairman, I offer the first amendment read by the Clerk. Section 2210 of the Revised Statutes provides that the salary of these officers shall be \$3,000 per annum, and to that amount the surveyor-general is clearly entitled by law. There is but one lawful way to reduce that salary, and that is to introduce a special act reducing the salary from \$3,000 to \$1,800. In the place of that, the Committee on Appropriations, arrogating to itself all the powers of legislation in this body, has sought to greatly reduce this salary and thus to set itself in plain opposition to the will of Congress as expressed in the act which created this office and authorized this salary. I do not ask for an increase to the amount authorized by law, simply because the surveyor-general of that State has not requested it. He does ask, however, that the salary of that office be increased to the amount now allowed to every surveyor-general in that region by the various appropriation acts that have been passed, namely, \$3,000.

The Committee on Appropriations, in reducing these salaries authorized by law throughout the mountain region, have reduced the salaries of the surveyors-general in Montana, New Mexico,

North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, Wyoming, and Colorado to \$2,000, and the State of Nevada presents the only exception, and there the salary is fixed at \$1,800. I will say in this connection that the appropriation for the State of Nevada for the general service is exceedingly small. The total appropriation provided by this act for Montana is \$14,000; New Mexico, \$13,000; North Dakota, \$9,000; Arizona, \$10,000; South Dakota, \$8,500; Utah, \$9,200; Washington, \$12,800; Wyoming, \$9,800, these appropriations covering salaries and office expenses. The total appropriation for the State of Nevada is only \$3,800. Now, every gentleman knows how vast the area is within the borders of that State. Just now there is a revival of interest in the State of Nevada, and there is probably more prospecting in that State than there has been for twenty years. The surveyor-general of that State writes me that there are more inquiries for public land than there have been for years, and the sum total in the two amendments I ask amounts to only \$400 additional appropriation—\$200 for the surveyor-general's salary and \$200 for the office expenses.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be defeated. The State of Nevada has very little use for this official at all. It is a well-known fact that the population of that State has been decreasing for years, although it is probably at a standstill now. We have this condition, that the amount appropriated in the last bill for the fiscal year 1900 for the mints and for the land office out there amounts to \$3 a head for every voter in the State. Think of it, you gentlemen who come from other States.

Mr. NEWLANDS. The mint is not under consideration here.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Now they seek to increase the salary and increase the office expenses to the extent of \$400 in a State where there can be but very little business, and where there is but very little business.

We have this remarkable condition, that for every voter in the State we appropriated on the bills last year \$3. And yet the gentleman comes in here and wants to increase this salary for some gentleman who occupies the position out there and who has been performing virtually no service for years and years. These officers at the mints and other public officers in the State of Nevada have been drawing salaries for years without performing hardly any service. We struck out the appropriation in the House for the mint at Carson City a number of times, but for some reason, on the Senate side, these appropriations are put back again, and I appeal to the House to vote down this amendment, because it is wrong. They certainly ought to be satisfied with the salary they are now receiving, and which they have been receiving since 1876, when the Appropriations Committee, under the lead of Samuel Randall, cut down the salaries, this among others. It is useless for me to stand up here and talk, for I have no doubt that the vote on this amendment will be almost unanimous against it.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. Chairman, it would have been more in accordance with good taste and good judgment on the part of the gentleman from Indiana had he confined his remarks to the appropriation now under consideration. I accept his challenge, however, and follow him in the line of debate regarding the total appropriations for that State.

It is true that the population of Nevada is small. It is true that the largest community there now is only five or six thousand people, where there used to be two or three communities aggregating fifteen to twenty-five thousand people. It is true that the great industry on which the prosperity of that State depended has been destroyed by national legislation.

It is true that a mint was sustained there for years, and it is true that in the crucial period of the war over \$600,000,000 of gold and silver came from Nevada, part of which was minted there, but the most of which was transported, in violation of the rights of that mint and that community, to the mint at Philadelphia to be there turned into coin. It is true that in every way the Appropriations Committee has sought to limit the appropriations for that State. It has sought to limit the employment of its people in industries belonging to the soil. It is true that silver now lying in the Philadelphia mint, which ought to have been coined in Nevada, has been taken for that purpose 3,000 miles away. It is true that that committee, by reducing the appropriations for the mint there from \$45,000 to twelve or fifteen thousand dollars, has reduced it to a mere assay office.

Mr. HEMENWAY. If you should coin silver at Carson City, would you not have to bear the expense of shipping the bullion there and then sending the coined money away? And is not the cost \$7 more on every thousand dollars coined?

Mr. NEWLANDS. What we complain of is that the bullion produced there was not left there. We claim that the millions of dollars' worth of bullion produced there ought to have been left there, and that those people ought to have been employed in minting the silver which was transferred to the Philadelphia mint.

The minting should have been done where the mining was done.

It was a business belonging to that community which should not have been diverted to an institution 3,000 miles away.

The gentleman referred to the alleged large appropriations made in the past. He alludes to the time when we were appropriating for the mint at Carson. By the bill of last year they have reduced that mint, as I have said, to an assay office, and this year there is an appropriation of only \$15,000 for that mint.

Now, I ask not only \$200 additional salary for a gentleman who has had an insufficient office force and has by reason of that fact been compelled to do more than the other surveyors-general in adjoining States, but I ask also for \$200 additional for the office force, to be expended in binding the records of that office, records which are now going to destruction and for the preservation of which the surveyor-general asked that an appropriation be made; and an estimate has been given by the Secretary of the Interior recommending this appropriation of \$200.

Now, this State has a large area; the Government has extensive areas of public land there. Is it not to the interest of this Government to have that State settled? Is it not to the interest of the country to have its mines and public lands surveyed? Is it not to the interest of the United States to sustain this State, which has been kept down by the hand of legislation and which is now making an effort toward resuscitation? And will the House deny it the paltry sum of \$400 in this work?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nevada.

The question being taken, there were—ayes 48, noes 55.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I call for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. NEWLANDS and Mr. HEMENWAY were appointed.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 65, noes 73.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will now report the other amendment offered by the gentleman from Nevada.

The Clerk read as follows:

In lines 6 and 7, on page 107, strike out "five" and insert "seven," so as to read "\$700."

Mr. HEMENWAY. I make the point of order that this is a change of existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. Section 2227 of the Revised Statutes provides that—

There shall be allowed for office rent, fuel, books, stationery, and other incidental expenses of the several offices of surveyors-general, such sums as may be appropriated for the purpose by Congress from year to year.

It seems to the Chair that this provision makes it possible to appropriate on this appropriation bill for the purposes named whatever sum Congress may see fit to appropriate. Therefore the Chair overrules the point of order; and the question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. NEWLANDS. One word in reference to this amendment. It proposes to increase from \$500 to \$700 the appropriation for office expenses in the office of the surveyor-general of Nevada, this extra sum of \$200 being desired for binding certain records in that office.

I read in this connection a letter from Mr. Hitchcock, Secretary of the Interior, to Mr. CANNON, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, February 16, 1900.

SIR: I have the honor to call your attention to an item in the Book of Estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, on page 84 of said book, which item reads as follows: "Office of the surveyor-general of Nevada, for rent of office for surveyor-general, etc., \$500." You will observe by the accompanying note to this item that this amount was intended to read \$700, and I have the honor to recommend that the amount of \$700 may be appropriated for this object in the legislative appropriation bill now under consideration by the House of Representatives.

Very respectfully,

E. A. HITCHCOCK, Secretary.

Hon. JOSEPH G. CANNON,
House of Representatives.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Nevada.

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 49, noes 63.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office First Assistant Postmaster-General: For First Assistant Postmaster-General, \$4,000; chief clerk, \$2,250; Superintendent of the Money-Order System, \$3,000; chief clerk Money-Order System, \$2,000; Superintendent of Free Delivery, \$3,000; 4 assistant superintendents of free delivery, at \$2,000 each; Superintendent of the Dead-Letter Office, \$2,500; 1 clerk of class 4, who shall be chief clerk of the Dead-Letter Office; chief of the salary and allowance division, \$3,000; assistant superintendent of the salary and allowance division, \$2,000; superintendent of post-office supplies, \$2,250; assistant superintendent of the division of post-office supplies, \$1,800; 1 clerk of class 4, chief of the correspondence division; 10 clerks of class 4; 18 clerks of class 3; 20 clerks of class 2; 42 clerks of class 1; 45 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 37 clerks, at \$900 each; 8 assistant messengers; 25 laborers; 2 pages, at \$300 each, and 5 female laborers, at \$480 each; in all, \$366,280.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move an amendment to this paragraph of the bill.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Strike out, on page 110, in lines 8, 9, and 10, the words "chief of the salary and allowance division, \$3,000; assistant superintendent of the salary and allowance division" and insert in lieu thereof: "superintendent of salaries and allowances, \$3,000; assistant superintendent of salaries and allowances."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For furniture, including \$1,500 for the office of the Auditor for the Post-Office Department, \$2,500.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move the amendment I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 115, line 4, strike out the words "five hundred."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. That the appropriations herein made for the officers, clerks, and persons employed in the public service shall not be available for the compensation of any persons permanently incapacitated for performing such service.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by inserting, after line 18 of section 4, the words of the amendment I send to the desk.

The amendment was read at length.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio makes the point of order that this is new legislation.

Mr. BROMWELL. No; not new legislation. But I desire to offer an amendment which is germane to the section itself, and which should properly precede the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HITT. Then I will withhold my amendment for the present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois will withdraw his amendment for the present, if there be no objection.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROMWELL. I now offer the amendment I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by adding after the word "service," in line 18, page 124, the words: "For the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of this section the head of each of the Executive Departments of the Government is hereby directed to certify from time to time to the Civil Service Commission the names of all persons employed in his Department or any of the branches of the public service subordinate thereto permanently incapacitated from any cause from performing the public service in which they are engaged, and upon receipt of said certification the Civil Service Commission shall strike the names of such persons from the classified service."

Mr. BROMWELL. The object of this amendment is to perfect the law as it now stands. We have been informed during the progress of this bill that the heads of Departments have absolutely refused to conform to the law, and are carrying upon their rolls and that the public money is being paid to persons who are permanently incapacitated from performing public service. Now, the object of this provision is to direct the head of any Department in which any of these permanently incapacitated clerks or other employees are engaged to certify the fact of the permanent incapacity of those persons to the Civil Service Commission, in order that their names may be taken from the classified service.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I have sent to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will again report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert after line 18, page 124, the following:

"SEC. 5—"

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to call attention to the fact that the section has been amended, so that it should read "at the end of the section."

Mr. HITT. "At the end of the section." It makes a new section and becomes section 5."

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert at the end of the section the following:

"SEC. 5. That permission is hereby granted to J. D. RICHARDSON to compile, edit, and publish, without expense to the Government, the state papers and diplomatic correspondence of the late Confederate States, and access to said papers and correspondence shall be given him for that purpose by the heads of the Executive Departments having such papers in charge, under such regulations as may be respectively prescribed by them."

Mr. HITT. The amendment explains itself. It is simply to facilitate this work which a member of the House is willing to undertake, one whom we know is amply qualified for the task, and it authorizes the officer in charge of these records, which are purely historical, to make them available for this purpose. The resolution provides that there shall be no expense to the Government.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Does this become a public document or a private publication?

Mr. HITT. It simply gives authority to the gentleman named—

Mr. DE ARMOND. Will it be a public document?

Mr. HITT. It will not necessarily. It will simply be what any of us could make if we chose to go there and prepare a historical work. If he will print it, we shall be glad to get it. If it is printed by Congress, we will get it gratuitously. If it is printed otherwise, we will get it as we can.

Mr. DE ARMOND. There ought to be something in the proposition, it seems to me, providing that this publication is not to preclude a similar publication by Congress, if Congress sees proper to undertake it. In other words, it ought not to be turned over to a private individual for individual use.

Mr. HITT. Authority now lies in all the Departments where records are to give access to documents as to scholars and students. This proposition or amendment is offered because I am told that the officer in charge of the records has said he would be glad to have such a resolution from Congress, to more emphatically enable him to put everything at the service of the investigating scholar.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It would not prevent the Government doing it.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Let us have a proposition to that effect, that this shall not be held in any way to interfere or hinder the Government in publishing the same thing as a public document.

Mr. HITT. I will accept that if the gentleman will put it in such form as he desires.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment to the amendment if the gentleman from Missouri will state it.

Mr. DE ARMOND. I can not very well do that without seeing the paper. My impression is that in cases where these documents belong to the Government, publication ought to be made by the Government as public documents for distribution among the people.

Now, I may say, incidentally to this, Mr. Chairman, that more or less of trouble has arisen with members of the House, over different parts of the country, consequent upon the turning over of the plates used in the publication of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, and there is more or less talk about whether the Government ought to publish that work again as a public document, to be distributed among the people, and the suggestion is made sometimes that there is difficulty in doing that, and that great expense will be incurred because the plates have been parted with. There is no disposition on my part to antagonize this, because I have no personal interest in the matter at all, but my own opinion is that generally these things should belong to the public, and where the public has to bear the expense of furnishing the copies they ought to be published by the Government for the public.

Mr. CANNON. I desire to call the attention of the gentleman from Missouri to the fact that this in no way contemplates that the Government shall make any expenditure whatever.

Mr. DE ARMOND. I understand that. What I am talking about is this proposition of whether the effect of this kind of legislation is not practically to place these things out in private hands, so that the Government, if it sees proper to publish them as a public document, will find itself somewhat hampered in several ways.

Mr. HITT. I foresaw the gentleman's point, and I agree with him in it. No authority is conferred by that proposition to allow any paper to be removed from the Government records in its proper place in the files. It is simply to give authority to the custodian of the records to grant access to them by this gentleman for historical purposes. This is done now in the Departments, giving any scholar who goes there access to them. It is responsive to a suggestion from General Ainsworth himself, as I am informed.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the amendment read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is preparing an amendment to the amendment. When it is prepared, the whole proposition will be reported.

Mr. DE ARMOND. I do not know that I care to offer any amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will again report the amendment. The amendment was again reported.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Chairman, I will move to strike out the word "authority" and insert the word "permission."

Mr. HITT. I will accept the amendment.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to say a word, but I want to say, so far as the statement of the gentleman from Missouri is concerned, there is no sort of idea of preventing the Government from printing these documents ad libitum. They can print as many as they wish at any time. This authority contained in the amendment will simply allow me to go to the Depart-

ment and get access to these documents and print them at my own expense and without a dollar's expense to the Government. That is all there is in this resolution.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Pardon me just a moment. I suggest that the last section be changed to 6 instead of 5.

The CHAIRMAN. That will be done, in accordance with the rule, without a motion.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I have been away a couple of days on account of business, and I find that my name has been called into question by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BELL] on a question of favoritism declared by the Administration in the case of certain banks given deposits, and in his efforts to fortify his side of the case he said that he had sent to each State treasurer in the United States and asked their custom in regard to the payment of interest on State deposits. I know nothing about the custom of other States, but in regard to the State of Connecticut I desire simply to explain—

Mr. HEMENWAY. I am compelled to make the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing the amendment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I am replying to a statement made concerning me during my absence.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman invokes the rule in opposition to the gentleman making a statement.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent that he may be allowed to proceed for ten minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, I regret exceedingly to be put to the necessity of insisting upon the rule.

Mr. HILL. I will endeavor to get some other time.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I move that the committee rise and report the bill to the House with a favorable recommendation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana moves that the committee rise and report the bill with amendments favorably to the House.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I had an understanding with the Chair that I was to be recognized to have a statement read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana has just invoked the rule, which shuts off all gentlemen.

The motion that the committee rise was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SHERMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 8347, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments and with a favorable recommendation.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded upon any amendment?

Mr. HEMENWAY. A separate vote is demanded on the amendment striking out the provision for the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. MUDD. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. HEMENWAY. I do not yield the floor.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments with the exception of that striking out the provision for the Civil Service Commission.

The question was taken; and the amendments were agreed to. The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment striking out the provision for the civil service.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the amendment read.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado asks to have the amendment reported. The Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after line 13, on page 23, down to and including line 2, on page 20, as follows:

"CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.

"For 3 Commissioners, at \$3,500 each; chief examiner, \$3,000; secretary, \$2,000; 8 clerks of class 4; 10 clerks of class 3; 13 clerks of class 2; 15 clerks of class 1; 3 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 2 clerks, at \$900 each; 1 messenger; 2 laborers; engineer, \$840; 2 watchmen; in all, \$91,340.

"For necessary traveling expenses, including those of examiners acting under the direction of the Commission, and for expenses of examinations and investigations held elsewhere than at Washington, \$7,000."

Mr. MUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CANNON. Let the House divide first.

Mr. MUDD. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CANNON. I hope the yeas and nays will be given—

[Cries of "Regular order!" on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. It is the sacred right of any member to de-

mand the yeas and nays, and it is for the House to determine whether they shall be taken.

Mr. MUDD. I will waive for the present the demand for the yeas and nays, and will ask for a division.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. MUDD. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—yeas 48, yeas 93.

Mr. MUDD. I demand the yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thirty gentlemen have arisen, a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are—

Mr. STEELE. Let us have the other side, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER (after counting). Seventy-nine gentlemen have arisen in opposition to the demand for the yeas and nays—a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are ordered. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 77, yeas 123, answered "present" 17, not voting 136; as follows:

YEAS—77.

Allen, Ky.
Baker,
Barham,
Bartlett,
Berry,
Boreing,
Brown,
Burleson,
Burnett,
Calderhead,
Clark, Mo.
Cooper, Tex.
Crawford,
Crump,
Cummings,
Davenport, S. A.
Davey,
Davis,
Dick,
Eppe,

Faris,
Finley,
Gardner, N. J.
Gibson,
Gordon,
Moon,
Mudd,
Grisgrs,
Grosvenor,
Henry, Miss.
Hepburn,
Hoffecker,
Johnston,
Joy,
Kerr,
Kitchin,
Kluttz,
Landis,
Latimer,
Lewis,
Linney,
Little,

Lybrand,
McPherson,
Maddox,
Metcalfe,
Moon,
Mudd,
Norton, Ohio
Otey,
Pearce, Mo.
Pearre,
Pugh,
Rhea, Ky.
Rhea, Va.
Rixey,
Robb,
Robbins,
Roberts,
Rodenberg,
Shelden,
Sheppard,

Showalter,
Southard,
Stokes,
Sulloway,
Swanson,
Talbert,
Tate,
Thomas, N. C.
Turner,
Van Voorhis,
Wachter,
Warner,
Weaver,
Wheeler, Ky.
Williams, J. R.
Williams, W. E.
Williams, Miss.

NAYS—123.

Adams,
Alexander,
Allen, Me.
Babcock,
Barber,
Bartholdt,
Bell,
Bishop,
Boutell, Ill.
Bowersock,
Brantley,
Brock,
Brosius,
Bull,
Burkett,
Burleigh,
Burton,
Butler,
Cannon,
Carmack,
Clayton, N. Y.
Cochran, Mo.
Cochrane, N. Y.
Cooper, Wis.
Cousins,
Cowherd,
Crumpacker,
Curtis,
Cushman,
Daly, N. J.
Dalzell,

De Armond,
Denny,
Dolliver,
Driggs,
Driscoll,
Esch,
Fitzgerald, Mass.
Fletcher,
Foss,
Fowler,
Gardner, Mich.
Gaston,
Gillett, Mass.
Glynn,
Graff,
Graham,
Green, Pa.
Grow,
Hall,
Hamilton,
Haugen,
Hawley,
Hedge,
Henry, Conn.
Hill,
Hitt,
Hopkins,
Howell,
Jones, Va.
Kieberg,
Lacey,

Lamb,
Littlefield,
Lloyd,
Long,
Loudenslager,
McCall,
McCleary,
McClulloch,
McLain,
May,
Miers, Ind.
Miller,
Mondell,
Moody, Mass.
Moody, Oreg.
Morris,
Napen,
Neville,
Newlands,
Nooan,
Otjen,
Parker, N. J.
Payne,
Pierce, Tenn.
Phillips,
Powers,
Quarles,
Ray,
Reeder,
Richardson,
Robinson, Ind.

Robinson, Nebr.
Ryan, N. Y.
Ryan, Pa.
Scudder,
Shackelford,
Shafroth,
Shattuc,
Sherman,
Sibley,
Sims,
Slayden,
Snodgrass,
Sperry,
Spight,
Sprague,
Stark,
Steele,
Stephens, Tex.
Stewart, N. Y.
Stewart, Wis.
Sulzer,
Sutherland,
Taylor, Ala.
Terry,
Thomas, Iowa
Wadsworth,
Waters,
Wilson, N. Y.
Zenor,
The Speaker.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—17.

Allen, Miss.
Bellamy,
Benton,
Bromwell,
Brundidge,

Burke, Tex.
Dayton,
Dinsmore,
Hay,
Hemenway,

Jett,
Lanham,
Loud,
McClellan,
Norton, S. C.

Olmsted,
Packer, Pa.

NOT VOTING—136.

Acheson,
Adamson,
Atwater,
Bailey, Kans.
Bailey, Tex.
Ball,
Bankhead,
Barney,
Bingham,
Boutelle, Me.
Bradley,
Brazzeale,
Brenner,
Brewer,
Broussard,
Brownlow,
Burke, S. Dak.
Caldwell,
Campbell,
Capron,
Catchinga,
Chanler,
Clarke, N. H.
Clayton, Ala.
Connell,
Coomes,
Corliss,

Cox,
Cromer,
Crowley,
Cusack,
Dahle, Wis.
Davenport, S. W.
Davidson,
De Graffenreid,
De Vries,
Dougherty,
Dovener,
Eddy,
Elliott,
Emerson,
Fitzgerald, N. Y.
Fitzpatrick,
Fleming,
Fordney,
Foster,
Fox,
Freer,
Gaines,
Gamble,
Gayle,
Gilbert,
Gill,
Gillet, N. Y.

Greene, Mass.
Griffith,
Grout,
Harmer,
Heatwole,
Henry, Tex.
Howard,
Hull,
Jack,
Jenkins,
Jones, Wash.
Kahn,
Ketcham,
Knox,
Lane,
Lawrence,
Lentz,
Lester,
Levy,
Littauer,
Livingston,
Lorimer,
Lovering,
McAlear,
McDowell,
McRae,
Mahon,

Mann,
Marsh,
Meekison,
Mercer,
Mesick,
Meyer, La.
Minor,
Morgan,
Muller,
Needham,
O'Grady,
Overstreet,
Polk,
Prince,
Ransdell,
Reeves,
Ridgely,
Riordan,
Robertson, La.
Rucker,
Ruppert,
Russell,
Salmon,
Small,
Smith, Ill.
Smith, Ky.
Smith, H. C.

Smith, Samuel W. Tawney,
Smith, Wm. Alden, Taylor, Ohio
Spalding, Thayer,
Sparkman, Thropp,
Stallings, Tompkins,
Stevens, Minn. Tongue,
Stewart, N. J. Underhill,

Underwood,
Vandiver,
Vreeland,
Wanger,
Watson,
Weeks,
Weymouth,

White,
Wilson, Idaho
Wilson, S. C.
Wright,
Young, Pa.
Young, Va.
Ziegler.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call my name.
The Clerk called the Speaker's name, and he voted in the negative.

The following pairs were announced:

During this session:

Mr. HULL with Mr. HAY.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH with Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

Mr. WRIGHT with Mr. HALL.

Mr. RUSSELL with Mr. MCCLELLAN.

Mr. PACKER of Pennsylvania with Mr. POLK.

Mr. WANGER with Mr. ADAMSON.

Mr. LOUD with Mr. DE VRIES.

Mr. LANDIS with Mr. MIERS of Indiana.

Until further notice:

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine with Mr. RIDGELY.

Mr. CLARKE of New Hampshire with Mr. VANDIVER.

Mr. MAHON with Mr. OTEY.

Mr. LORIMER with Mr. SWANSON.

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio with Mr. LANHAM.

Mr. KETCHAM with Mr. MULLER.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota with Mr. SMALL.

Mr. SOUTHWARD with Mr. LENTZ.

Mr. CROMER with Mr. BURNETT.

Mr. HARMER with Mr. FITZPATRICK.

Mr. OVERSTREET with Mr. GRIFFITH.

Mr. LOVERING with Mr. SMITH of Kentucky.

Mr. BINGHAM with Mr. COONEY.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH with Mr. FLEMING.

Mr. WEYMOUTH with Mr. S. W. DAVENPORT.

Mr. CAPRON with Mr. LEVY.

Mr. STEWART of New Jersey with Mr. STALLINGS.

Mr. FARIS with Mr. BRANTLEY.

Mr. NEEDHAM with Mr. NORTON of South Carolina.

Mr. ACHESON with Mr. KITCHIN.

Mr. MANN with Mr. JETT.

Mr. BAILEY of Kansas with Mr. BELLAMY.

Mr. YOUNG of Pennsylvania with Mr. BRADLEY.

Mr. DAYTON with Mr. MEYER of Louisiana.

Mr. MESICK with Mr. BURKE of Texas.

Mr. BISHOP with Mr. CAMPBELL.

Mr. BARHAM with Mr. BRENNER.

Mr. BARNEY with Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi.

For this day:

Mr. WATSON with Mr. UNDERHILL.

Mr. EDDY with Mr. BROUSSARD.

Mr. FORDNEY with Mr. SALMON.

Mr. GROUT with Mr. MCALEER.

Mr. KNOX with Mr. FOX.

Mr. JACK with Mr. CUSACK.

Mr. PRINCE with Mr. LIVINGSTON.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota with Mr. MOON.

Mr. TOMPKINS with Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. TAWNEY with Mr. UNDERWOOD.

Mr. OLMSTED with Mr. CONNELL.

Mr. FITZGERALD of New York with Mr. HENRY of Texas. If present, Mr. FITZGERALD of New York would vote "no," and Mr. HENRY of Texas would vote "aye."

Mr. THAYER with Mr. ATWATER. If present, Mr. THAYER would vote "no," and Mr. ATWATER would vote "aye."

Mr. JENKINS with Mr. DE GRAFFENREID.

Mr. GILL with Mr. HEMENWAY.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois with Mr. BREAZEALE.

Mr. GAMBLE with Mr. RUCKER.

Mr. LANE with Mr. BROWNLOW.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts with Mr. WILSON of Idaho.

Mr. LAWRENCE with Mr. CROWLEY.

Mr. S. W. SMITH with Mr. ELLIOTT.

Mr. O'GRADY with Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana. If present, Mr. O'GRADY would vote "no."

Mr. VREELAND with Mr. BANKHEAD.

Mr. MERCER with Mr. COX.

Mr. DOVENER with Mr. CATCHINGS.

Mr. LORIMER with Mr. YOUNG of Virginia.

Mr. CORLISS with Mr. MCRAE.

Mr. DAHLE of Wisconsin with Mr. DOUGHERTY.

Mr. HEATWOLE with Mr. MEEKISON.

Mr. MARSH with Mr. RANDELL.

Mr. MINOR with Mr. RUPPERT.

Mr. MORGAN with Mr. CHANLER.

Mr. DAVIDSON with Mr. BALL.

Mr. SPALDING with Mr. RIORDAN.

Mr. THROPP with Mr. STOKES.

Mr. WEEKS with Mr. CLAYTON of Alabama.

Mr. KAHN with Mr. LESTER.

Mr. GILLET of New York with Mr. GAYLE.

Mr. FREER with Mr. HOWARD.

Until Thursday next:

Mr. FOWLER with Mr. BARTLETT.

Until Monday next:

Mr. REEVES with Mr. SPARKMAN.

Mr. MERCER. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. COX. I withdraw my vote.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman's vote will be withdrawn.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I did not hear my name called, and I was giving attention to the call of the roll.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in his seat?

Mr. STOKES. I was in the Hall.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman listening to hear his name called?

Mr. STOKES. I was.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.

Mr. STOKES's name was called, and he voted "aye."

Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I desire to know if a quorum has voted.

The SPEAKER. A quorum has voted.

Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my vote. I am paired with the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. BARNEY.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman's vote will be withdrawn.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. McDOWELL. I did not hear the pair announced, but I would like to have my name recorded as "present."

The SPEAKER. Did the gentleman answer when his name was called?

Mr. BROMWELL. I announced the fact that I was paired with Mr. McDOWELL.

The SPEAKER. Did the gentleman say "present" when his name was called?

Mr. BROMWELL. I was present and referred to the fact that I was paired with Mr. McDOWELL. I did not say "present." I wish to be marked "present."

The SPEAKER. That can not be done.

Mr. BELLAMY. Mr. Speaker, when my name was called, I voted "aye." I find I am paired with Mr. BAILEY of Kansas, and I wish to withdraw my vote and be marked as "present."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, that will be done.

Mr. BARTLETT. It was announced from the Clerk's desk that I was paired with the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. FOWLER. We have a general pair, but we both voted, and I desire to have the pair withdrawn.

The SPEAKER. The pair will be withdrawn.

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. MEYER. I voted "aye" on this question under a mistaken idea that Mr. MEYER was present. I find that he is absent, and I request that my vote be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request will be granted.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Speaker, I voted without knowing that I was paired. I have learned since that I was paired, and I therefore wish to withdraw my vote.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman's vote will be withdrawn.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. HULL. If he were here, I would vote "aye."

Mr. EPES. Mr. Speaker, I have a general pair with the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MCCALL. We are both present and both voted "aye."

Mr. PACKER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with my colleague, Mr. POLK. I voted, and I desire to withdraw my vote.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania desires that his vote be withdrawn. The request will be granted, if there be no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. I am paired with the gentleman from Texas, Mr. DE GRAFFENREID. He is absent on account of sickness. If he were present, I should vote "no."

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the Clerk announced a pair between the gentleman from California, Mr. METCALF, and myself. I wish to withdraw the pair temporarily on this vote.

The SPEAKER. The pair will be withdrawn.

Mr. MCCALL. The gentleman from Virginia, Mr. EPES, through an error, announced that I had voted in the affirmative. I voted "no" on this question.

Mr. EPES. I understood the gentleman to say that he had voted "aye."

Mr. MCCALL. No; that is a mistake.

The SPEAKER. It will be understood that this pair is withdrawn.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Speaker, did my colleague, Mr. DE VRIES, vote? The SPEAKER. He did not.

Mr. LOUD. Then I withdraw my vote.

The SPEAKER. The vote will be withdrawn, without objection.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, on the second roll call I was in the Hall of the House and was listening for my name, but did not hear it. On the first roll call I attempted to say that I was paired, and supposed that I was marked "present." I wish to be so recorded, as I am paired with the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. McDOWELL.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I was announced as paired. I am not aware of having joined in any pair.

The SPEAKER. The pair will be withdrawn.

The result of the vote was then announced as above stated.

The bill was then ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HEMENWAY, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. BAKER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 6267. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act to suspend the operation of certain provisions of law relating to the War Department, and for other purposes."

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, Mr. WILLIAM E. WILLIAMS of Illinois obtained leave to withdraw from the files of the House without leaving copies the papers in the case of Henry S. La Tourrette, Fifty-fifth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows: To Mr. NAPHEN, for four days, on account of important business.

To Mr. BURTON, for Monday, February 19, on account of important business.

To Mr. RUCKER, for ten days, on account of important business.

To Mr. DOUGHERTY, for ten days, on account of important business.

To Mr. COONEY, for ten days, on account of important business.

To Mr. ATWATER, for one day, on account of sickness.

LEAVE TO PRINT BILLS AND REPORTS.

Mr. COOPER of Texas. I ask unanimous consent for the reprinting of House bill No. 4615 and report 214, upon the abandoned-property bill, as reported by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HENRY] from the Committee on War Claims. The copies already printed of this report and bill have been exhausted.

There being no objection, the order for a reprint was made.

Mr. PAYNE. I ask unanimous consent for a reprint of House bill 8245, the bill relating to trade with Puerto Rico, and the report thereon. My information from the document room is that the entire edition of these documents is exhausted.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The gentleman's request includes the views of the minority?

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

There being no objection, the order for a reprint was made.

And then, on motion of Mr. PAYNE (at 3 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a statement of expenditures in the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey for the year ended June 30, 1899—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, replying to the resolution of the House relating to occupation of public property by railroads in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. CUMMINGS, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8596) to appropriate \$10,000 to inclose and beautify the grounds and repair the monu-

ment on the Moores Creek battlefield, North Carolina, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 349); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred House joint resolution 2, reported in lieu thereof a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 177) in relation to monument to prison-ship martyrs at Fort Greene, Brooklyn, N. Y., accompanied by a report (No. 350); which said joint resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HEPBURN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2538) to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 351); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8659) to increase the pension of Thomas P. McCracken; and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 8663) to provide a chaplain for each regiment in the United States service, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 8664) to authorize the construction of an addition to the public building at Hartford, Conn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 8665) authorizing and requiring the Metropolitan Railroad Company to extend its lines on old Sixteenth street—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McCLEARY: A bill (H. R. 8666) to authorize the reimbursement of officers and men of the Army and Navy for medical expenses incurred during leave or furlough—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 8667) to authorize an increase in the limit of cost of the harbor improvement at Lorain, Ohio—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. STARK: A bill (H. R. 8668) approving a revision and adjustment of certain sales of Otee and Missouri lands in the States of Nebraska and Kansas—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 8667) authorizing the Washita Town Company to purchase certain lands from the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache tribes of Indians, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SHAFROTH (by request): A bill (H. R. 8668) relating to the administration of law and justice in the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee: A resolution (H. Res. 153) relating to the number of United States troops sent to the Philippine Islands—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRENNER: A bill (H. R. 8669) granting an increase of pension to Eliza A. Lake—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOREING: A bill (H. R. 8670) to increase the pension of Stephen J. Watts—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DINSMORE: A bill (H. R. 8671) for the relief of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, at Mount Comfort, Washington County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8672) for the relief of George T. Hammock—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8673) for the relief of James Baker and John W. Andrews—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: A bill (H. R. 8674) for the relief of William Wilson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8675) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Parkison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 8676) granting a pension to Marcus Bain—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 8677) granting a pension to Harriet Belote—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 8678) for the relief of William H. Waers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OTJEN: A bill (H. R. 8679) granting an increase of pension to Chauncey Sheldon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 8680) granting a pension to James R. Hicks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8681) granting a pension to Samuel Clayton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 8682) to place upon the pension roll Louisa C. Germain, widow of Charles Germain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 8683) granting a pension to Feuby Newby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WANGER: A bill (H. R. 8684) granting an increase of pension to John Rymond—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: A bill (H. R. 8685) to correct the naval record of William Perkins—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SNODGRASS: A bill (H. R. 8686) to grant a pension to James A. Tulloss, of Rhea County, Tenn., a soldier of the Indian wars—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 8689) granting an increase of pension to Isaac B. Hoyt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS: Petition of Hon. George F. Edmunds and other leading lawyers, for relief for the law library of Congress—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BURKE of Texas: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Mrs. Wyona A. Dixon—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BURKETT: Petition of James Livingston and other citizens of Sterling, Nebr., asking that the Government continue the manufacture and distribution of blackleg vaccine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DOLLIVER: Resolutions of Baldwin Lodge, No. 273, International Association of Machinists, of Boone, Iowa, favoring the passage of House bill No. 4728, providing for leaves of absence to certain employees of the Government—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania: Resolution of the Fireman's Association of the State of Pennsylvania, in opposition to the passage of Senate bill No. 1743, establishing a division for the regulation of insurance among the several States—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. GROUT: Petition of D. K. Simonds and 9 other fourth-class postmasters of Bennington County, Vt., praying for the passage of the Cummings bill, increasing the compensation of postmasters of the fourth-class post-offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolution of the Boston (Mass.) Merchants' Association, in favor of the laying of competing cable lines to Cuba—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Petitions of John Hoglund, John Clarke, and others, asking for an appropriation for the purchase of a site and the erection of a marine hospital at Galveston, Tex.—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HILL: Petition of George F. Keeler and other post-office clerks of Stamford, Conn., favoring the passage of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HULL: Remonstrance of J. E. Smith and other business men of Winterset, Iowa, against a parcel-post system—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. McCLEARY: Remonstrance of A. C. Chittenden, of Marshall, Minn., against the parcel-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of the Commercial Club of St. Paul, Minn., urging the construction of the Nicaragua Canal—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of the New York Mercantile Exchange, in favor of a law placing all substances made in the semblance of butter under the police power of the several States into which they may be carried—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: Papers to accompany House bill No. 5935, for the relief of Jeremiah Wilkie, of Heaton, Ind.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: Petition of the Port Clinton Lumber and Coal Company and others of Port Clinton, Ohio, for the improvement of the harbor at that point—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SPRAGUE: Papers to accompany House bill No. 8102, for the relief of Eugene Hayden, United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Petition of the classified civil-service employees of the military department at St. Paul, Minn., for the favorable consideration of a bill for the retirement of

Government employees in the classified service—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, resolution of the St. Paul Society of Homeopathic Medicine and Surgery, St. Paul, Minn., urging the passage of joint resolution No. 48, granting permission for the erection of a monument in Washington, D. C., in honor of Samuel Hahnemann—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, resolution of Coopers' Union No. 61, of St. Paul, Minn., protesting against the passage of a bill for the abolishment of one-sixteenth and one-eighth packages of beer—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STOKES: Papers to accompany House bills Nos. 2565 and 8462, extending free delivery of mail along star routes—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WEYMOUTH: Petition of Samuel W. Harris and 29 other members of Post No. 19, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Massachusetts, in support of the House bill No. 4742, to provide for the detail of active and retired officers of the Army and Navy to assist in military education in public schools—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Mrs. Truby Newby, of Mill Shoals, Ill.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

MONDAY, February 19, 1900.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Friday last, and was interrupted by

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I ask that the further reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

Mr. COCKRELL. I hope that will not be done. I think there are divers reasons why the Journal should be read. If the Senator will look around the Chamber he will see one reason why it should be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal will be read.

The Secretary resumed and concluded the reading of the Journal, and it was approved.

BRUNSWICK (GA.) HARBOR IMPROVEMENT.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 22d ultimo, a report from H. L. Marindin, assistant, Coast and Geodetic Survey, relative to the amount of work done since his last report on the outer bar of Brunswick, Ga., its cost, and its value to the Government, and an estimate as to the annual cost of maintaining the channel across that bar; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the annual report of the Commissioner of Patents for the calendar year 1899; which was referred to the Committee on Patents, and ordered to be printed.

CONSULAR CLERKS AT CITY OF MEXICO.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of State recommending an increase in the allowances for clerks at the United States consulate at the City of Mexico from \$1,200 to \$2,400 per annum; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

CONSUL AT TORONTO.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of State recommending an increase in the salary of the United States consul at Toronto, Canada, from \$2,000 to \$3,000 per annum; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

CONSUL AT BOMBAY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of State recommending an increase in the salary of the United States consul at Bombay from \$2,000 to \$3,500 per annum; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

CONSUL AT WINDSOR, NOVA SCOTIA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of State recommending an increase in the salary of the United States consul at Windsor, Nova Scotia, from \$1,000 to \$1,500 per annum; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.